

The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XIX.

June, 1913.

No. 6.

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

PUBLISHED BY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,
BALTIMORE.

The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XIX.

June, 1913.

No. 6.

THE AUTHOR OF THE APOCALYPSE.

The author names himself John, i. 1, 4, 9, xxii. 8. Such an unqualified reference implies that he is well-known. He does not describe himself as an apostle. That word is only used once in St. John's Gospel, xiii. 16. Here it would be out of place, for the writer is acting as a prophet. It is the book, that is sent; not he.

St. Justin Martyr, holding a conversation with the Jew Trypho under the colonnades of Ephesus in 132, A. D., was proving a Millennium from *Isaiah*, lxx. 17-25, and added, "Among us, a certain man, whose name was John, one of the Apostles of the Christ, in an apocalypse made to him, prophesied that those, who believed in our Christ, will spend a thousand years in Jerusalem; *Dialogue*, c. xxx., quoted by Eusebius, *History*, iv. xviii.

The Montanists were prominent about 160 A. D., as Polycrates of Ephesus about 196 A. D., in his letter to Victor of Rome, mentions them together with Thraseas, who was martyred about thirty years before. We may therefore date the origin of Montanism about the time when St. Justin Martyr was holding his dialogue with Trypho, though the *Heresies* of Epiphanius, xlviii-li., would leave us to choose between 135, 157, and 182. Now according to the Montanist prophetess Priscilla, Christ had told her that Pepuza, a village in Phrygia, was holy, "for here Jerusalem comes down out of the heaven." Tertullian,

who joined the sect in 199, witnesses to the Montanist tradition regarding the authorship of the *Apocalypse*, from which they had borrowed their imagery. In his work *Against Marcion*, iii. 14, which he began in 207-208 A. D., he writes, "The Apostle John also in the *Apocalypse* describes a two-edged sword as proceeding out of the mouth of God."

Melito was bishop of Sardis, one of the Seven Churches, and wrote under Marcus Aurelius, between 161 and 180, A. D., "concerning the Devil and the *Apocalypse* of John." Eusebius, who tells us so in his *History*, iv, xxvi., would surely have added some qualifying word, had the name John not denoted the Apostle.

St. Irenaeus was probably born between 120 and 125, A. D. In his youth at Smyrna, he was a pupil of St. John's friend, St. Polycarp, with whom he appears to have visited Rome in 154. He again visited Rome in 177 as an ambassador to the Pope, Eleutherius, from the churches of Lyons and Vienne. There in the capital city, his disciple Hippolytus heard him deliver those lectures, which were afterwards elaborated into his great work *Against Heresies*, written under Eleutherius, *Heresies*, iii. iii, 3, most probably between 182 and 188. In this, he speaks of the *Apocalypse* as written by "John, the disciple of the Lord," iv. xx. 11, iv. xxx. 4, v. xxvi. 1, v. xxxv. 2, and "John," iv. xxi. 3, v. xxxvi. 3. As to this "John the disciple of the Lord," St. Irenaeus, iii. i. 1, identifies him with the disciple, "who also reclined on His bosom, and delivered the Gospel, when he was sojourning in Ephesus of Asia."

The *Muratorian Fragment* contains the witness of the Roman Christians about 170, A. D., and unhesitatingly ascribes the *Apocalypse* to the Apostle John. St. Clement of Alexandria, in his *Pedagogue*, ii, 12, before 195, A. D., refers *Apoc.* xxi. 18, to "the Apostolic voice"; and in his *Stromateis* or *Miscellanies*, written about 202 A. D., he ascribes the book to "John," so indicating the author as St. John the Apostle. Origen, in his *Commentary on St. John*, i. i. 6, begun about 219 A. D., uses the expression, "The Apostle and Evangelist in the

Apocalypse.” And in his *Commentary on St. Matthew*, xvi. 16, begun after 246, he identifies the author with John, the brother of James and son of Zebedee.

Hippolytus of Rome, antipope in 217, had been a pupil of St. Irenaeus, according to Photius, *Bibliotheca*, codex 48, 121, 122, and had preached before Origen at Rome about 212 A. D. In his treatise *on the Anti-Christ*, xxxvi., he asks, “Blessed John, Apostle and disciple of the Lord, what did you see and hear concerning Babylon?”

It is unnecessary to pursue the tradition beyond these testimonies, which are substantially the voice of the second century. It may, however, be well to note in passing that St. Ephraem the Syrian, deacon of Edessa, who died in 373, A. D., quotes the *Apocalypse* in his treatise *on the Second Advent*, vol. ii. of the Greek translation and speaks of it as written by the Apostle, p. 248, by John, p. 252, and by John, the theologian or divine, p. 194. Since St. Ephraem uses the *Apocalypse* as Scripture, it would appear that there was then a Syriac version, though the book was afterwards excluded from Rabbula’s Peshitta, “the simple” Syriac version of 411, A. D.

Now in 377, Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, published his work *on Heresies*, a monument of scholarly industry and unscholarly judgment. In that book, li. 3, he tells us of an anti-Montanist and anti-Millenarian sect, which rejected both St. John’s *Apocalypse* and his *Gospel*, and attributed them to Cerinthus the heretic. To excuse their rejection of the *Apocalypse*, they asked, “What benefit to me is the *Apocalypse* of John, telling me about seven angels and seven trumpets?” They also declared that there was no church of Christians in Thyatira, though the author had said, “Write to the angel of the church, to the [angel] in Thyatira.” As such men were opposed to the Johannine Gospel of the Logos or Word, St. Epiphanius named them the Alogi, which not only means without Logos, but also without reason, the simple old man evidently enjoying his punning description of rationalists as irrationalists.

Epiphanius knew of these Alogi through Hippolytus of Rome,

who had himself resisted such views in the person of the Roman Gaius or Caius. This Gaius has sometimes been confused, as by Photius, *Bibliotheca*, codex 48, with Hippolytus, and described as a presbyter, who became "Bishop of the Gentiles." He was really a violent anti-Montanist; and therefore he somewhat impetuously opposed the Johannine writings, to which the Montanists had appealed. During the papacy of Zephyrinus, 198-217 A. D., according to the *History* of Eusebius, VI. XX., and while Hippolytus was still a Catholic, Gaius, who appears to represent the Alogi of Epiphanius, held a disputation with the Montanist Proclus at Rome. And Eusebius, in his *History*, III. XXVIII., preserves a passage of the book, entitled the *Disputation*, in which Gaius said that "Cerinthus also, who was lying by means of apocalypses, as [if they had] been written by a great apostle, introduces marvellous tales to us, as [if they had] been shewn to him by means of angels, saying that after the resurrection, there will be the kingdom of the Christ on earth; and [men in] the flesh, living in Jerusalem, will again serve desires and pleasures. And being an enemy to the scriptures of God, he, willing to deceive, says that there comes to be a measure of a millennium [to be spent] in marriage festival."

This leads us to the views of Dionysius, in whose statements, carefully recorded by Eusebius in his *History*, VII. XXIV. XXV., we can learn what men of old could allege against the Johannine authorship. But it is necessary to remember that Dionysius had been a pupil of Origen. He had also succeeded Heracles as head of the Catechetical School in 232 A. D., and as bishop of Alexandria in 248 A. D. He represented therefore the allegorizing method, which Origen and the Alexandrian School had received from the Hellenist Jew, Philo, who had learned it from the Stoic interpretations of Homer. Dionysius was consequently opposed to the literal method of interpretation, in which Lucian and the Antiochian School had followed the Palestinian Jews. But the literal interpretation of the millenium as an earthly kingdom of our Lord found an able and earnest voice in an Egyptian bishop, the Biblical scholar

Nepos. He wrote a *Refutation of the Allegorists*, which so influenced the region of Arsinoë, that Dionysius hastened from Alexandria. At that time, 255 A. D., Nepos was dead, and his book could not defend itself. So Dionysius won an easy victory in three days, his main positions being the impossibility of understanding the *Apocalypse* in a literal sense, and the improbability of its Johannine authorship. It is the latter, which concerns us now.

In his *History*, VII. xxv. 1, written between 305 and 325 A. D., Eusebius quotes the work of Dionysius *on the Promises*. "Certain, therefore, of those before us," wrote the Alexandrian bishop, "rejected and packed away the book altogether, correcting every chapter, showing that it is both unknown and illogical, and that the superscription lies. For they say [not only] that it is not John's, but that it is not even an apocalypse, [for it would be an apocalypse] which is exceedingly and thickly covered with the veil of ignorance. And it is impossible [not only] that anyone of the Apostles, but also that anyone at all of the saints, or of those belonging to the church, has been the author of the composition. But Cerinthus, who also composed the Cerinthian heresy, [so]-called from him, willed to prefix a trustworthy name to his own fiction. For this was the dogma of his doctrine, that the kingdom of the Christ will be on earth."

If we compare these last words and those which follow them in Eusebius with the statement of Gaius, already quoted from Eusebius, III. xxviii, and the remainder of that passage, we may see that Dionysius is referring to Gaius. The bishop then would not follow so revolutionary a method as that of Gaius, but contents himself with denying that the John of the *Apocalypse* is the Apostle and the son of Zebedee, who wrote the *Gospel*. This is not offered as the witness of tradition, but solely as a conjecture by Dionysius himself, who writes, "For I conjecture both from the character of both [works], and the form of the words, and the literary execution of the scroll, that [the author] is not the same:" Eusebius, *History*, VII. xxv. 5.

To maintain this thesis, Dionysius continues, "For the evan-

gelist nowhere interpolates his own name, nor even proclaims himself, either by means of the Gospel or by means of the *Epistle*." Then the bishop notes that the *Gospel* and the *Epistle* contain expressions, to which there is nothing corresponding in the *Apocalypse*. The *Epistle*, to say nothing of the *Gospel*, does not mention the *Apocalypse*, nor does the *Apocalypse* mention the *Epistle*. Yet St. Paul gave some glimpses of his apocalypse [or revelations] by means of his epistles. Besides, there is the difference in phraseology between the *Apocalypse* on the one hand and the *Gospel* and *Epistle* on the other, the language of the former being accused of foreign idioms and even of solecisms in some places. Dionysius then raises a question as to the identity of John the Apocalyptist, saying, "Therefore, as to its being John, who writes these things, we must believe him, because he says so. But what [John] this [may be, is] not manifest, for he did not say, as often in the *Gospel*, that he himself was the disciple beloved by the Lord, or even he who reclined on His Breast, or even the brother of James, or even the eyewitness and ear-witness of the Lord."

As a John other than the Apostle, Dionysius mentions John Mark, who was generally known in Christian circles, not by his Hebrew and Synagogue name, John, *Acts*, xiii. 5, 13, but by his Roman *praenomen*, or first and individual name, Marcus, *Acts*, xv. 37, *Philem.* 24, *Col.* iv. 10, 2 *Tim.* iv. 11, 1 *Pet.* v. 13. Dionysius indeed would not say that this was he, who wrote the *Apocalypse*. He thought that the author was some other of those in Roman Asia. And to prove that there were two Johns in Ephesus, he repeats some hearsay that "there were two mounments in Ephesus, and each was called John's." Now no one, except Dionysius, appears to have heard of the second tomb. Polycrates of Ephesus, writing to Pope Victor about 196, speaks of the Apostle's burial at Ephesus. But that of a second John is not suggested by him, or by St. Augustine, or by any monument. Duchesne, in his *Ancient History of the Church*, i. p. 143, note, in the French edition, concludes that the story of the second tomb is unconfirmed, and that Ephesus knew of only one John.

It is true that there are differences between the *Apocalypse* and the later *Gospel* and *Epistles*. But equally great differences can be found between St. Paul's *Epistles to the Corinthians*, the first in the autumn of 55 and the second in the summer of 56, and his *Epistle to the Romans* in January, 57. The choice of words is determined in a great measure by the subject. Therefore, we are not surprised to find that the scroll of the *Apocalypse* does not contain these words and phrases, which occur in the *Gospel*: the truth, to be from the truth, to be from God, eternal life, the ruler of this world, the children of God, the children of the Devil, to be born, darkness and boldness. "To do the truth," *Gospel*, iii. 21, can hardly be added to this list, for the *Apocalypse*, xxii. 15, contains the parallel phrase, "to do a lie." The use of the word *ἀμνός* for "lamb" in the *Gospel*, i. 29, 36, as in *Acts*, viii. 32, and 1 *Pet.* i. 9, is due to the Greek Vulgate of *Isaiah*, liii. 7. In the *Gospel*, xxi. 15, as in the *Apocalypse*, but nowhere else in the Greek Testament, the word is *ἀρνίον*.

In the *Gospel*, it is true, St. John does not name himself; but in accordance with the prophetic tradition, he should do so in the prophetic *Apocalypse*. The quiet spirit, attributed to the Evangelist, is only found in cc. xiii-xvii. His spiritual view is paralleled by the absence of a temple in the *Apocalypse*, xxi. 22. This book, we need to remember, is written on the model of Old Testament prophecy. As to its ungrammatical forms and constructions, we can in many cases determine the reason for them. And as the writer shows elsewhere in the book that he knows the rules, we cannot use the particular instances to prove him ignorant.

There are also similarities between the books, and these of such a kind as to outweigh the dissimilarities. For example, the word *ἀληθινός*, "true," is found 10 times in the *Apocalypse*, 9 times in the *Gospel*, 4 times in the *First Epistle*, and only 5 times in the rest of the Greek Testament. The verb *δίδωμι*, "I give," is used peculiarly 12 times in the *Apocalypse* and 8 times in the *Gospel*. The verb *νικάω*, "I conquer," occurs 16 times in the *Apocalypse* and 6 times in the

First Epistle. The frequent and emphatic use of the word ἔργα, "works," is evident in both *Apocalypse* and *Gospel*. In both, we note the words, μαρτυρία, "testimony," μαρτυρέω, "I witness," or "testify," τηρέω, "I keep carefully," and σκηύω, "I dwell." Both illustrate an unidiomatic use of ἐκ, "out of," for the partitive genitive. In both, and only in both among New Testament books, have we the words ἐβραϊστί, "in Hebrew," παρφύρεος, "purple," φοῖνιξ, "palm," σφραγίζω, "I seal," used without an object, ἀρνίον, "lamb," ὄψις, used of the human "face," *Apoc.* i. 16, *Gospel*, xi. 44, ἀπό, "from," used to mark distance, *Apoc.* xiv. 20, *Gospel*, xi. 18, xxi. 8, and ἐπί with a dative to mean "concerning," *Apoc.* x. 11, *Gospel*, xii. 16. If the *Apocalypse*, xxii. 2, expresses "on each side" by ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐκεῖθεν, the *Gospel*, xix. 18, does so by the form ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐντεῦθεν. Both, *Apoc.* i. 7, and *Gospel*, xix. 37, quote *Zech.* xii. 10, and render the Hebrew verb *dāqārû* as "they pierced," implicitly rejecting the Greek Vulgate, which apparently misread the order of the Hebrew consonants as *rāqādû*, and translated the verb as "they danced in triumph over," that is, "mocked."

Once in the *Apocalypse*, xvi. 16, St. John omits to explain a Hebrew name; and once in the *Gospel*, v. 2, an Aramaic one. In both, *Apoc.* vii. 14, *Gospel*, xxi. 15-17, the words "Thou knowest" are used, and used in the sense of "Thou knowest better than I." Both have the words, "received from My Father," *Apoc.* ii. 27, *Gospel*, x. 18. And both speak of what things "have been written in this scroll," *Apoc.* xxii. 18, 19, *Gospel*, xx. 30.

The *Apocalypse* presents three enemies of our Lord in the Dragon, the First Wildbeast, and its prophet, the Second Wildbeast. So in the *Gospel*, the Devil, the Roman Empire and a degenerate Judaism oppose Him. In the *Apocalypse*, Satan appears as the Dragon; in the *Gospel*, as the Prince of this world; and in the *First Epistle*, as the Spirit of Antichrist. Indeed, the themes of the *Apocalypse* are stated by the *Gospel* in these words,

John xii. 31. Now is the judging of this world:

Now the Prince of this world will be cast
forth without;

and

John xvi. 33. But be courageous:

I have conquered the world.

Although the *Apocalypse* displays our Lord in His triumph, and the *Gospel* unveils Him in His humiliation, and though the former is symbolical in style and the latter historical, yet the latter is filled with anticipation of triumph, and describes the miracles as signs. In both, there is the presentation of two conflicting forces. In both, our Lord is called the Word. In both, there is no reference to the manna. In both, our Lord is the Bridegroom of the Church and He who gives the water of life. And in both, episodes are introduced into the narrative, those of the Gospel including i. 16-18, iii. 16-21, iii. 31-36.

As the *Apocalypse* is based on the number seven, so is the *Gospel* on the number three. In the latter book, our Lord is found three times in Galilee and three times in Jerusalem. Three of His miracles in each place are noted. Twice three feasts are selected to mark His ministry. Twice three days mark the opening of the narrative, and again form Passion Week. Three days are connected with Lazarus. Three words are selected from those spoken on the Cross. Three times the Risen Lord appears. And there are the three confessions, those of Peter, Philip and Nathanael.

In both books, there are illustrations of prolepsis or anticipation. The fall of Babylon in *Apoc.* xviii. is anticipated in xiv. 8. The descent of the New Jerusalem in *Apoc.* xxi. 2, 10, has already been indicated in iii. 12. The tree of life, seen in *Apoc.* xxii. 2, 14, had been promised in ii. 7, as the white garments of *Apoc.* vii. 9, 14, had been promised in iii. 5. So in the *Gospel*, the anointing of our Lord is recorded in xii. 2, but was already referred to in xi. 2. And the *Gospel*, in xii. 7, anticipates the burial of our Lord, recorded in xix. 39-42.

When we compare the outlines of the books, as Milligan has

done in his *Lectures on the Apocalypse*, pp. 61-69, we are struck by the similarity. There is a prologue in *Apoc.* i., and *Gospel*, i. 1-18. In *Apoc.* ii. iii., we see the churches in the world, where the *Gospel*, i. 19-ii. 11, will present our Lord. Anticipations of the ultimate triumph follow in the *Apoc.* iv. v., and the *Gospel*, ii. 12-iv. Then there is the conflict, *Apoc.* vi-xviii., *Gospel*, v-xii. In both, there is now a little breathing space and a supper, *Apoc.* xix. 1-10, *Gospel*, xiii-xvii. Then there is the second and final struggle, *Apoc.* xix. 11-xxii. 5, *Gospel*, xviii-xx. And in each book, there is an epilogue, *Apoc.* xxii. 6-21, *Gospel*, xxi, which refers to the Second Advent, *Apoc.* xxii. 12, *Gospel*, xxi. 22.

But Dr. Samuel Davidson, in his *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. ii. pp. 187, 188, has formulated a modern series of objections to the Johannine authorship. He cannot believe that the bosom friend of Jesus could ascribe the same praise to Him as to God, *Apoc.* vii. 10, and even assign Him the Incommunicable Name Jehovah, xxii. 13. That, however, is to forget the unanimous testimony of the Primitive Church to the Deity of Jesus; and it is to acknowledge the *Apocalypse* as a witness to the Catholic doctrine. Then Dr. Davidson does not think that St. John could put himself among the Apostles, who were dead, and speak of the twelve names on the twelve foundation stones, xxi. 14. But the names did not necessarily imply that those who bore them, were dead; and "the twelve" having become a technical name for the Apostolic college, is now used by St. John as an element in the compound symbol. Dr. Davidson thinks also that there is a contradiction between the promise of a seat with Christ in the Father's throne, iii. 21, and our Lord's statement that it is not His to give the seat on His right hand or that on His left, *Mark*, x. 40, but to those for whom it has been prepared. But surely there is no contradiction. The promised seat is not necessarily that of unique honour at the right hand or the left. And such a promise cannot be held impossible, because the fitness of the soul and the authority of the Father are implied conditions.

Again Dr. Davidson argues from *Acts*, iv. 13, that St. John

was ignorant and unlearned in the Jewish sense, and therefore did not possess the Old Testament and Rabbinical learning of the *Apocalypse*. The words in the *Acts* really implied that he was unlettered and unofficial. They expressed the judgment of the Sadducees and Pharisees, who would not have regarded St. Peter and St. John as skilled in the Rabbinic casuistry, afterwards embodied in the *Mishnah*, or Oral Law, and its commentary, the *Gemara*. So far from valuing, the Rabbinic schools did not like, and the Sadducean priesthood scorned the prophetic and apocalyptic literature, which the people studied. Besides, the *Apocalypse* does not show more technical acquaintance with Rabbinical learning than might have been acquired in ordinary conversations and discourses. There is therefore no more reason for denying the *Apocalypse* to St. John, than there would be for denying the *Pilgrim's Progress* to Bunyan on the ground that the Anglican clergy regarded him as an unlearned and ignorant man, and that the book shows a deep knowledge of the Sacred Scriptures as well as a considerable acquaintance with Christian theology and ethics.

Dr. Davidson, however, returns to the attack. The denial of certain men's apostleship, *Apoc.* ii. 2, is interpreted as inconsistent with St. John's recognition of St. Paul's apostleship to the Gentiles, *Gal.* ii. 9. But this is to assume that St. Paul is referred to in *Apoc.* ii. 2. Yet that passage clearly indicates men alive at the time of writing; and we can show that it was written a generation after St. Paul's death. Finally, Dr. Davidson holds that our Lord's prediction of the Holy City's fall and His own return is contradicted by the Apocalyptic vision of a preserved city and of the Messiah's millennium after Rome's fall. This objection does not distinguish things that differ. Our Lord's coming and the coming of His kingdom are terms, which have many applications, including not only the Final Appearing, but even our Lord's ministry on earth, *Luke* xvii. 21, and the Fall of Jerusalem. But the main error in the objection is the taking the predictions as to Jerusalem and its visible judgment, and equating them to the apocalyptic symbols of pagan Rome and the invisible kingdom.

Dionysius, as we have seen, suggests that there were two Johns in Roman Asia. It is alleged that Papias, as quoted by Eusebius, *History*, iii. 39, confirms the conjecture. Of Papias, Irenaeus, himself a pupil of Polycarp, says in his *Heresies*, v. xxxiii. 4, that he was the hearer of John and companion of Polycarp and an ancient man. Now, as Waddington has shown in his *Fastes des prov. Asiat.* i. 219-221, Polycarp was martyred on Saturday, February 23, 55 A. D. He had then, as he testified, served Christ for 86 years. His birth must therefore be dated as early as 69 A. D. at least, but probably earlier, about 60, when St. Paul reached Rome. Papias appears to have died before Polycarp, and is described by Irenaeus as an ancient man. So we may date his birth still earlier. Through Eusebius, *History*, iii. 39, he tells us, "But if it also happened that there came anyone, who had followed the Elders, I used to inquire for the words of the Elders—what Andrew, or what Peter said, or what Philip, or what Thomas or James, or what John or Matthew or anyone else of the disciples of the Lord—what things both Aristion and the Elder John, disciples of the Lord, are saying."

From this statement, Eusebius gathered that there were two Johns in Roman Asia; and St. Jerome too readily adopted that conclusion in his book on *Illustrious Men*, xviii. But we note that "the Elder" is a title given to John and not to Aristion; and it is given to the former in an especial way, so that he is not merely one of the Elders, but "the Elder." A sufficient reason for this is found in the *Second* and *Third Epistles of St. John*, who there announces himself simply as "the Elder."

For the distinction between the two Johns, there is no ground in the ancient world, except the conjectures of Dionysius and Eusebius, and the dissimilarities between the *Apocalypse* and the *Gospel*. It is certainly an important fact that a second John was never heard of till Dionysius expressed his own surmise. Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Gaius, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Origen lived and died without any supposition of the kind. And the mention of John without any

qualification is in favour of there having been one and one only. Sometimes indeed, he is John the Apostle; sometimes, as in his own *Gospel* and the *Muratorian Fragment*, line 10, he is a disciple; and sometimes, as in his own *Second* and *Third Epistles*, he is the Elder.

There is much evidence for identifying John the Apostle, John the disciple of the Lord, John the Elder, and John who reclined upon the Lord's Breast.

St. Irenaeus describes the *Fourth Gospel* as written by the Apostle, III. v. 1, by John the Apostle, I. ix. 2, III. xi. 9, by the disciple of the Lord, twice, by John the disciple of the Lord, seventeen times, and by John, eleven times. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, wrote to Pope Victor I., of Rome, about 196 A. D., in a letter quoted twice by Eusebius, *History*, III. xxxi., v. xxiv., that "John, who reclined upon the Breast of the Lord—who became a priest, *ιερεὺς*, having borne the [highpriestly] frontlet and [was] a witness and a teacher—has fallen asleep in Ephesus." If we supplement this evidence of Irenaeus and Polycarp by that for the authorship of the *Apocalypse* and the three *Epistles*, we have a body of testimony, which becomes self-contradictory, unless it is one and the same John, who is denoted by the reference.

Eusebius indeed identified the daughters of the Apostle Philip at Asiatic Hierapolis with the daughters of the Evangelist Philip at Judea Caesarea, *History*, III. xxxi. He suggests a distinction between the John of the *Gospel* and the John of the *Apocalypse*, *History*, III. xxxix. 5. So the historian identified, when he should have distinguished, and distinguished, when he should have identified.

But now we are told that St. John and St. James, his brother, were martyred at the same time by Herod Agrippa I. in 44 A. D. According to Georgios Hamartolos, George the Sinner, it was stated by Papias in the second book of his *Logia* or *Oracles*, that John the Apostle was put to death by the Jews. George's *Chronicle* was written about 860 A. D.; he himself is elsewhere found inaccurate in quotation; and only one of the twenty-eight existing manuscripts contains the passage, which is therefore worthless.

But, it is urged, there is a manuscript, containing a late epitome of a work by Philip of Side. Unfortunately, the epitomizer used several books, so we are very far from certain that he was indebted to the *Christian History* of Philippus Sidetes for the statement, which concerns us now. Assuming that he was, then Philip of Side, early in the fifth century, composed a passage from some sentences in Eusebius, and added the words, "Papias in the second book says that John the Theologian and James his brother were killed by Jews."

To the support of this are brought

Matt. xx. 23 You will drink My Cup,

and

Mark x. 39 You will drink the Cup, which I am drinking.

Further, the Syriac Calendar of Edessa, in a manuscript of 411 A. D., describes John and James as apostles, martyred at Jerusalem on December 27. A Carthaginian Calendar, however, substitutes John the Baptist, also commemorated on June 24, for John the Apostle.

It is not easy to account for this unhistorical tradition. Some assume the loss of a word, which would have explained the presence of St. John's name, whether it was originally that of the Apostle or that of the Baptist. But one thing is certain, and that is the untrustworthy character of the story. Both St. Irenaeus and Eusebius knew the works of Papias, and found no such tale there, for they, like all our early witnesses, represent St. John as an old man in Ephesus. The *Acts of the Apostles* knows nothing of St. John's early martyrdom. The *Epistle to the Galatians* is positive proof to the contrary, for St. John could hardly, outside of speculative exegesis, be martyred in 44 A. D., and yet be a pillar of the Jerusalem church in 49 A. D., Gal. ii. 9. To remove this evidence, Schartz attempted to identify John the pillar with John Mark.

Grace builds on nature; and no one was more fitted to write the *Apocalypse* than the younger of the Boanerges, *b'nê réghesh* "the sons of tumult." This name, given them by our Lord,

Mark iii. 17, indicated their vehemence. It will be remembered that they desired to imitate Elijah's invocation of fire, *Luke*, ix. 54, 4 *Kings* i. 10, and that John forbade a stranger to cast out devils in our Lord's name, *Mark* ix. 38. The same spirit of vehement zeal is plain enough in the *Apocalypse* and in the story, told by Polycarp to Irenaeus, *Heresies*, III. iii. 4, that St. John rushed from a public bath in Ephesus, lest it should fall on him and the heretic Cerinthus, whom he met there.

Therefore, having regard to the whole evidence, we may without hesitation conclude that the *Apocalypse* was written by St. John, Apostle, disciple and elder.

GEORGE S. HITCHCOCK.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF IRISH MISSIONARIES TO MEDIÆVAL CULTURE.

Reading the lives of Irish missionaries in Europe, one fact stands forth from the pages with striking prominence, and it is that a central virtue of the missionary, of the apostle, is a gift of great daring. Courage or daring is, indeed, a quality necessary for greatness of achievement in any sphere of human thought, or action. This is so true that one writer attributes the decline of Napoleon's military star to the loss of his former tremendous courage. For some time before the battle of Waterloo, Napoleon hesitated in his plans; the man, who was impatient of counselors as dallying idealists, sought advice from his inferiors. His brother placed a great political scheme before him towards the end of his career, and, when he hesitated, the brother said: "Only dare!" and Napoleon sadly answered: "I have dared too much already." The spring of that great will was broken; when Wellington conquered at Waterloo, according to this writer, he conquered the shadow of Napoleon.

The same virtue is necessary for the missionary in advancing the greater cause of Christ. Jeremiah, the prophet of the old dispensation, and a type of apostolic zeal, was bidden not to fear the face of man. In his sublime mission he was to be "a wall of brass" and "a pillar of iron," and "a fortified city"; against him men would fight but they would not prevail. He was to beset kings and princes and priests to tear up and pull down and scatter and annihilate iniquity, and to build up and plant justice. The first Christians, too, were characterized by their boldness and confidence in preaching the message of Christ. And St. Paul—the greatest of the Apostles—gives one of the secrets of his success when he says—"If any man dares, I dare also."¹

The first, and one of the greatest Irish missionaries, and

¹ 2nd Corinth. c. 11, v. 21.

exiles, was St. Columba, who belonged to the sixth century. Imaginative, warm-hearted, impetuous, fiery even to occasional rashness—his was a temperament eminently suited to his poetical and oratorical gifts. Love of Nature, Love of Land, and Love of God were the three great impulses of his life; nay, rather, with him they were contained in the one primal impulse of Love of God. There are those who believe that the Love of Nature was a discovery of recent times. It must be emphasized to those over-confident moderns that the Hebrew shepherd, who was to be afterwards the royal psalmist, could have in the plains of Palestine grand visions of Nature's glories. He can learn, also, that the early Irish scholars were open-eyed to the subtlest beauties of nature. Nature was to them a legible script, and they could interpret the anger of the tempest, the sighing of the wind, and the laughing of the sunlit waters. In an ancient poem about Durrow Columba draws attention to the wind singing through the elms, the blackbird's note, and the cuckoo's chant in the angelic land of Eiré.

In a poem translated by Dr. Healy, the substance of which is probably the genuine work of Columba, his love of fatherland is beautifully expressed:

"I stand on the deck of my bark,
And gaze on the southern sea,
But alas! and alas! my Eri
Forever is hidden from me.
How bright are the eyes of my Eri,
Like the gleam of angel's wings,
And sweet is the breath of my Eri,
Her voice is the music of Spring."

The two most prominent events in Columba's life were the battle of Cuildreimhne (Cooldrevney), and the convention of Drumceat. The battle originated in a dispute between St. Columba and St. Finnian. As books were rare, and valuable at this time, Columba made a furtive copy of Finnian's gospel. Finnian claimed the copy, and when Columba refused, the matter was referred to the High King of Ireland, who decided in favor of Finnian on the ground that to every cow belonged

its own calf, and so the copy belonged to the original and its owner. A scion of the royal race of Niall of the nine hostages, Columba could not repress his high spirit angered by this adverse decision, and he summoned all his clansmen to fight against the High King. The battle of Cuildreimhne was fought, and three thousand were slain. In penance for this thoughtless act Columba was ordered by his confessor to leave Ireland forever for Scotland. Here he did missionary work in the Irish colonies of Dalriada, and amongst the pagan Picts; he tried to save as many souls as he caused bodies to be slain in the previous battle; and he founded innumerable Columbian monasteries.

The other great public event of his life—the Convention of Drumceat—took place to decide the question of the position of the Irish bards. These had made themselves odious owing to their troublesome exactions, and the venomous satire of their pens. The convention was solemn, and representative of all classes, as was the wont in ancient Ireland. A multitude of bishops and of priests were present; the fair forms of the queen and her female attendants graced the occasion. Royalty opened the proceedings; King Hugh led the attack on the odious bards. The whole tide of feeling was turning against the poets, and there was need of a man of great personality and influence to effect a change in the general opinion. That man was at hand; Columba entered the lists. A bard himself, he championed the cause of the bards with a rare oratory. "If the bards were exterminated," he argued, "who would celebrate the great deeds of mighty kings? Who would sing a lonely dirge for the noble dead?" The views of Columba prevailed; and the human tide was stemmed, and turned in favor of the bards. In the end of the seventh century Columba found a Boswell in St. Adamnan, whose biography is, perhaps, the completest work of the kind in medieval times.

The great namesake of the last Saint—Columbanus—belonged to the end of the sixth and the beginning of the seventh century. In the case of either of these Irish Saints there is nothing very appropriate about their assumed name, Columba,

or dove, except on the principle of "Lucus a non lucendo." It is like calling the bold Hildebrand a gentle dove. Columbanus, after being educated at the famous school of Bangor, left Ireland and his kinsfolk with considerable difficulty—his mother stopping him on the threshold in his wander-impulse for Christ. Placing the cause of Christ above the dearest ties of flesh and blood he journeyed to Metz, and Luxeuil in the valley of the Vosges mountains. Here he spoke the Christian truth at the cost of bitter persecution. When the French clergy found fault with the Irish calculation of Easter, and with the Irish tonsure, which was in front of the head, and which they picturesquely called the tonsure of Simon Magus, Columbanus retorted by telling them that it would have been more profitable for them to attend to the reformation of their own vices. With the fearless zeal of a John the Baptist *redivivus* he denounced for his concubinage Thierry, the king of the place. The result was that he was ordered to be shipped back to his native land, but the elements did not favor the project with the result that the ship had to return to continental shores again, and this time Columbanus directed his steps past the former scene of his labors, and towards Zurich and Bregenz on the shore of Lake Constance in Switzerland. Here his former fiery zeal was nothing abated. With more courage than discretion, he and his little band of monks cut down the sacred trees of the pagan natives, burned their temples, and hurled their idols into the lake. The effect of this daring action was that he had to leave this province. With the undaunted courage of a Hannibal or a Napoleon, but with the higher aim of advancing Christ's kingdom, Columbanus next undertook to cross the Alps, and he reached the fertile plains of Bobbio, where he founded a famous monastery.

Though he did not reach Rome, he wrote several letters to its august rulers. With a manly freedom that reminds one of apostolic times, and of the rebuking of St. Peter by Paul, he strongly insinuated against Pope Boniface the charge of having favored heretics.² In another place he stimulates the Pope

² Ep. v. 9. Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, 80, c. 279.

by the hypothetical clause—"If you are a true Christian."³ This is an example of what he calls himself the "forwardness" of his daring spirit, and is accompanied in the same epistles by clear and unequivocal statements about the primacy of the Pope, "the Pastor of pastors," and about Rome being the empress of all churches.⁴

The fruits of his missionary zeal may be judged from the number of monasteries that followed the Columban rule; Lure, Roman-Moutier, Beze, Saint Ursanne, and Remiremont in Burgundy; Fontenelle and Joumiegues on the Seine; Jouarre and Rebais on the Marne; Leuconnais near Amiens; St. Centule on the Somme; St. Bertin among the Morini.

The eighth century furnished a prominent Irish scholar and Saint in Virgilius, or Fergil of Salzburg. His life, epitaph, local tradition, and Alcuin—all support the fact of his Irish nationality. In Bavaria Saint Virgilius disputed concerning the form of baptism with St. Boniface, apostle of Germany, himself probably of Irish origin. Owing to the deficient knowledge of the clerics at the time some employed the form—"Ego te baptizo in nomine Patria et Filia et Spiritua Sancta." Virgilius affirmed the validity of this form, and Boniface denied it. They sought and obtained from Pope Zachary a clear reply concerning the Catholic doctrine, defending the view of the Irishman concerning the validity of the form. But this decision did not end the friction between these two very human Saints. Virgilius, equipped with the splendid knowledge of the famous Irish schools of these days, was abreast of his age in defending the sphericity of the earth, and the existence of Antipodes. On account of this innocent-looking doctrine in physical geography he was regarded as a dangerous spirit, and denounced to the Pope by Boniface. The fact was that Boniface and Pope Zachary, for that matter, did not know science as well as Virgilius. Boniface misunderstood the doctrine, caricatured it, and procured the condemnation of a thing of straw. This can be judged from the cautious reply of Zachary

³ Ep. v. 12.

⁴ Ep. v. *Introd.*

—"If it be proved that he holds that there is another world, another sun and moon, and other men beneath the earth, expel him from the Church, and degrade him from the priesthood." Virgilius, probably, explained the true sense of his doctrine, as he was afterwards appointed bishop of Salzburg in Austria. He taught the existence of other men beneath the earth; he was made to teach the unjustifiable and fancied conclusion that there was another sun and moon and other men not born of Adam, and unredeemed by Christ.

The most distinguished scholar of the ninth century was John Scotus Erigena. Scot, or Scotus, in the ninth and down to the eleventh century meant Irishman; afterwards it was naturally applied to the children of the land that the Irish colonized in early times, Scotland. Prudentius, who lived with Scotus Erigena, says—"Thee, the subtlest of all, Ireland gave to France." He was appointed head of the Palatial School by Charles the Bald. His Irish wit did not abandon him in exile. Sitting at table opposite Charles the Bald, the latter made the dangerous experiment of having a joke at the Irishman's expense, and asked, "What separates a Scot from a sot?" Instantly was flashed the repartee—"Only the table." The fact that he was a small man is enshrined in another anecdote. Sitting at table with two tall clerics he had one small, and two large fishes to distribute, and he gave the two large ones to himself, and the small one to the two clerics,—defending the equity of the division by the remark,—"Here you have one small (himself) and two large (fishes), and there you have two large (clerics) and one small (fish)."

His works are a treatise "On Predestination," also a translation of the Pseudo-Dionysius, of which Anastasius, the Roman librarian, says that "the charity of God and the neighbor was the mistress that taught him, and that the Holy Spirit made him fiery and fluent, though a barbarian from the end of the world." Based on the Neo-Platonic philosophy of the Pseudo-Dionysius is his famous work "On the Division of Nature." This work was ordered to be burned by Pope Honorius the Third in 1225 A. D. It taught a most brilliant and fascinating

form of Pantheism. According to Erigena spirit was an emanation of God, and matter was an emanation of spirit, and into the essence of God they will all return. Although he never had a good word to say of heretics, he was himself an unconscious one. But he ventured on uncharted seas; he entered untravelled fields of thought; he was led astray by the authority of an alleged apostolic work—*The Pseudo-Dionysius*; yet in all his intellectual wanderings of the most daring type his restless spirit, he tells us, ever found the homeward way to God.⁵ His is a kindred spirit with the German Pantheistic Idealists of the present day; and through them his name is becoming better known, and his star is again mounting the heavens. He is also supposed to be akin to modern Rationalists, but all they have in common is a defense of the rights of reason; but in regard to the abuse of reason, in setting it up as independent of authority, Erigena and Rationalism part company. In a sentence which shows his characteristic eloquence he writes—"I am not so brow-beaten by authority, nor so fearful of the assault of less able minds as to be afraid to utter with fearless forehead what true reason clearly determines and indubitably demonstrates; especially as there must be question of such only amongst the wise, to whom nothing is more sweet to hear than true reason, nothing more delightful to investigate, when it is found."⁵ Reflecting the knowledge of the Irish schools of the times, Erigena and Albinus of Pavia, and other Irish Saints prepared the ground for the classics and philosophy of the medieval universities, and this was not the least of their great contributions to European culture.

These are but a few examples of Irish missionaries abroad. I have fixed the telescope of history on a few stars in the galaxy of the Irish apostles that diffused the white light of science and Christian purity throughout Europe. What land in Europe was left unvisited by them? The numerous libraries of the continent of Europe contain copies of Irish manuscripts, and their marginal glosses in Gaelic enabled the great German

⁵ Cf. Healy, *Ireland's Ancient Schools*, p. 577.

⁶ *De Divisione Naturae*, Liber 1. 67.

scholar, Zeuss, to write a grammar of the Irish language. What land did not bear their numerous footprints emitting the fragrance of the charity of Christ? Was it Scotland? It had Columba, first of exiles and missionaries amongst the Picts and Scots; also Adamnan, his biographer. Was it England? It has the Columbian monks of Lindisfarne in Northumberland, Aidan, Colman, and Finnan; also Diuma, and Kellech amongst the Middle and the East Angles.

France had Fiacre of Meaux, Fursey, the Visionary, and Foilan, Gobban, and Dicuil of Lagny; Fridelinus the Traveller (who also labored in Switzerland and along the Rhine); Clemens, Charlemagne's professor at Paris; Erigena, also of Paris; Marianus Scotus, of Mayence, the Chronicler, of the eleventh century.

Spain had the later Sedulius not to be confounded with another Sedulius called the Christian Virgil. He wrote a book endeavoring to show that the Irish were of Spanish origin.

Belgium and Holland had Livinus, martyr of Flanders; St. Dymphna, the virgin martyr of Gheel, patroness of an asylum there; also Fursa, apostle of Belgium; Foilan and Ultan, instructors in Psalmody in the convent of Lavelle in Brabant.

Austria had Virgilius, apostle of Salzburg, and of Carinthia.

Iceland disclosed Irish books and croziers upon the arrival of the Scandinavians. Ernulph and Buo are mentioned as apostles of the Norwegian colonists. Also there is mentioned an early Icelandic bishop of the name of John.

Switzerland had St. Gall, disciple of Columbanus, whose name is immortalized in one of the prominent cantons.

Italy had Columbanus of Bobbio, also Frigidian in Lucca; St. Cathaldus, of Tarentum, and his brother Donatus of Lecce; Albinus, Charlemagne's professor at Pavia; also Dungal, who wrote "On The Two Solar Eclipses of 810 A. D." as well as a "Defense of Images Against Claudius of Turin."

Germany had Arbogast, bishop of Strassburg; St. Killian of Franconia in Wurzburg (to be distinguished from another Killian, disciple of Columbanus, and abbot of St. Martin's monastery at Cologne); Albuin, of Saxony; Demcad, of Cologne;

Marianus Scotus of Bavaria and Franconia, a poet, and commentator, and a scribe who wrote gratuitously for the poor widows and poor clerics of Ratisbon. "If you ask me," writes his eloquent Irish biographer, "what will be the reward of Marianus and pilgrims like him, who left the sweet soil of their native land, free from every noxious beast and worm, with its mountains and hills, its valleys and its groves suited to the chase, the picturesque expanse of its rivers, its green fields and its streams welling up from the purest fountains, and like the children of the patriarch, Abraham, came without hesitation unto the land pointed out to them by God, this is my answer: they will dwell in the house of the Lord with the angels and archangels of God forever; they will behold in Sion the God of gods, to whom be honor and glory for eternal ages." Possessing only long staves, leathern wallets, with drinking bottles fastened to their girdles, these apostolic men explored other lands as Poland, Bulgaria, Russia and Egypt.

The lives of these Irish exiles illustrate in a striking manner some of the fundamental characteristics of the Celtic race. As in other subjects in the natural order, so too in the history of a people there are fundamental laws guiding its destiny. There are immutable principles governing its manifestations down through the long ages. The lives of these missionaries are an example of the spiritual destiny of the Celt. Other immutable qualities in the history of the race reinforce this central attribute. A vivid imagination, a gleam of mysticism, a fiery, enthusiastic nature, saddest pathos accompanying the punishment that in our fragile nature seems to be the result of the defense of the right, unfailing humor given by a gracious providence to uphold the suffering—these are some characteristics, some contributions of the Celt to humanity, and they attractively set forth his sense for the spiritual, his interest in the other world, his love for the unseen things that are eternal. "The dreamer lives on forever, but the toiler dies in a day." These gifts would have been of little use to humanity were they not accompanied by another unvarying characteristic of the Celt, his restless genius, his wandering impulse which,

apostle-like, diffused the other gifts to the ends of the earth. This wandering missionary spirit of the Celt is not a thing of the past. In medieval times it was, indeed, prominent. The harvest fields are changed according to the circumstances of the time and the opportunities of language, but today in far-off Australia, in South Africa, amid the snows of Canada. and beneath the Southern Cross of Argentina, at present commencing missionary work in China—wherever the Irish exiles are found—they are fulfilling the mission of their race.

G. PIERSE.

THE ST. PAUL SEMINARY,
ST. PAUL, MINN.

SHAKESPEARE AND FREE WILL.

The freedom of the will is an ever recurring problem in philosophy, in practical ethics and in art. The history of philosophic thought is largely the history of the theories pertaining to free will, from the days of the Epicureans down to the days of the Pragmatists. Every ethical teacher, however impatient he may have been of fine spun distinctions beloved of his more speculative brethren, has found himself at every turn face to face with the same problem. And the artist, too, despite his differing outlook on life and man, has to some extent realized that, whether he interpret life through the medium of sculpture or painting, poetry or music, the freedom of the will is an issue eminently pertinent to the understanding and the expression of the finer spirit of human nature.

This is especially true of the dramatist. Whether or not we object with Mr. William Archer to the Aristotelian designation of the drama as a conflict of wills, we cannot ignore the fact that without some manifestation of volitional force there can be no drama. The play does not, indeed cannot, concern itself merely with still life; it must show man in action and man in action implies man willing. It is a far cry from the comedies of Aristophanes to the comedies of Mr. George M. Cohan, but into both the element of volition enters in no unmistakable way. Every dramatist, according to the measure of his gifts, must be something of a philosopher, he must possess theories of life; and those theories will be found to constitute the guiding principles of his craftsmanship and the soul of his interpretation of life.

In his manner of presenting his theories of life the dramatist necessarily parts company with the philosopher. The latter has a case to state and he states it, a problem to solve and the solution—adequate or not—is at once forthcoming; his realm

is to a great extent the realm of the abstract, and he is concerned greatly with universal ideas. The presentation of his notions is ordinarily direct and unveiled. The dramatist, on the other hand, is often unconscious of his philosophy. He is concerned, not with man, but with men; what appeals to him is not the law of general averages, but the phenomenon of the exceptional instance. While his characters are almost always types, he is not interested in them as such, but as individuals. His general aim is to portray and to interpret human life; but he achieves that aim by linning individual souls.

Again, the philosopher is usually a subjective thinker—witness Epictetus and Nietzsche—while the dramatist is of necessity an objective thinker. Though characteristically sweeping and inexact, Macaulay's contention that Byron had nothing of the dramatic in his genius was based upon a profound truth—Byron was too subjective to find in the dramatic form the most adequate medium of expression. A random sentence taken from the writings of a philosopher or a lyric poet may prove to be an epitome of the author's outlook on life, the golden key that unlocks the treasure of his thought; but isolated passages from a dramatic writer are not necessarily the expression of the author's fundamental theory of life—in most cases they are merely the expression of the attitude of his character creations. The dramatist's life philosophy, if we are to reach it at all, can be glimpsed only from his works taken as a whole, from his prevailing tone and attitude, from the sum total of the impressions made upon us by his plays.

The attitudes taken by the most representative dramatists of the world toward the problem of free will may be reduced to three. The first attitude is that which regards men as powerless in the grasp of fate, and this view has been notably voiced by Sophocles. The second attitude—which is to a vast extent the present-day attitude—stresses the elements of heredity and environment, and it receives its most adequate expression in the plays of Ibsen. The third attitude is that which, while not ignoring the element of fortuity in human affairs and making due allowance for heredity and environment, insists

that each man is personally responsible for the making or the marring of his own fortune. Shakespeare stands as the representative of this view.

Sophocles was a child of his race. The Hellenic stand against the eternal riddle of life took the form of evasion rather than of solution. When the strands of life become hopelessly tangled, it is an easy and often a graceful thing to lay the blame at the feet of the Fates; and that such was the prevailing procedure of Sophocles is the abiding impression one gets from a study of those of his plays that have been preserved to us. But seven out of the hundred odd dramas he composed are open to our perusal; but those seven sound so persistently the note of fatalism that we are justified in assuming that it was the characteristic expression of their remarkable author.

"Search where thou wilt," says Antigone in *Œdipus at Colonus*, "Thou ne'er shalt find a man with strength to escape when fate shall lead him on." This is the dominant note of the tragedy of Sophocles. The tragedy of life, to him, consists in the very fact that man is helpless, that individuals are but pawns upon the chessboard of the gods. The story of the unhappy Œdipus is the story of the relentlessness of fate. Aware of the dreadful prophecy that he should slay his own father and marry his own mother, Œdipus flees from his native place and seeks to set fate at defiance; but the means he chooses to avoid his destiny prove to be the means of fulfilling the oracle in all its repulsive details.

Sophocles, "who saw life steadily and saw it whole," gave a consistent expression of his philosophy in the words he put into the mouth of Creon, overtaken by the avenging fates: "I thought some god smote me from above with crushing weight, and hurled me, wretched man, into ways of cruelty." From one point of view this may be taken as the self-defence of the writhing offender, seeking to evade the force of the lash, but read in relation to its context, the passage yields no such interpretation. Creon, whatever else may be thought of him, was no cringer; and here he gives voice to his underlying convictions, convictions which the Chorus shares: "I see that

from olden time the sorrows in the house of the Labdacidæ are heaped upon the sorrows of the dead; and generation is not freed by generation, but some god strikes them down, and the race hath no deliverance."

This attitude toward life minimizes, or rather negatives, free will. The pathos that invests such a character as Œdipus is the pathos of hopelessness; turn in whatsoever way he will, the foreordained victim cannot escape his destiny. "Happiest beyond compare never to have tasted life."

The present-day attitude toward free will—an attitude which results from experimental science gone mad, knowing no confines—has been well expressed by Ibsen. Just what the future will think of Ibsen is not our immediate concern. He merits attention here because, in his own most representative plays and in those of his numerous imitators, we find the volitional element in man dwarfed almost beyond recognition. It is sometimes said that the Ibsen cult has already lost its power with play-readers and play-goers. However that may be, the influence of Ibsen, both as regards technique and as regards content, is still in evidence among playwrights. Any one, for instance, who fails to detect a striking kinship between Ibsen's *Ghosts* and Mr. Galsworthy's *The Pigeon* can hardly be credited with much acumen.

The key ideas in Ibsen's dramas taken as a whole are heredity and environment. Without a frank recognition of this fact the plays are—what more than one critic, including Mr. William Winter, declare them to be—a series of incomprehensible nightmares. Hedda Gabler is thoroughly unaccountable until we remember that she is the daughter of old General Gabler; that explains her bravado under fire and her uncomfortable penchant for toying with pistols. Nora Helmer baffles analysis until we recognize in her the inhabitant of the doll's house—a doll suddenly awakened to more than mechanical life. Often an audience has passed out from the once popular Ibsen matinee performance of *Ghosts* dazed, impressed, but not enlightened. Why does Oswald plead for the sun? The boy is what he is because of his father's character and his mother's training.

The dominant impression one derives from the bulk of Ibsen's dramas—at least one exception is found in the case of *The Pillars of Society*—is that life is a sad, hopeless affair at best and that man is far from being the architect of his own fortunes. The will is at most an impotent spectator, not an active power for good or ill. The obvious and futile lesson of the Ibsen drama is that if we would make a man what he should be we must begin our reform with the man's grandfather. In one of his final productions Ibsen seems to sum up life as life appears to him:

Irene: We see the irretrievable only when—

Rubek: When—?

Irene: When we dead awaken.

Rubek: What do we see then?

Irene: We see that we have never lived.

Compared with Sophocles and Ibsen, Shakespeare stands forth as the champion of the freedom of the will. His protagonists range from a callow Romeo to a super-sophisticated Hamlet; and everywhere we get the definite and distinct impression that, whether they rise with Henry V or fall with Macbeth, they reap according as they have knowingly and willingly sown.

Yet there is nothing one-sided about Shakespeare's presentation of the essential truths of life. We have no reason to believe that he was consciously, or at least deliberately, attempting to prove a thesis in favor of the supremacy of the human will. A true artist, he was not of set purpose a preacher. He merely saw life with clear and untroubled eyes, and related and interpreted what he saw.

Were one to make a careful study of such a handbook as Miss O'Connor's "Index to the Works of Shakespeare," there can be no doubt that numerous passages might be discovered which, wrenched from their context and ingeniously arranged, would lead the unsuspecting observer to conclude that Shakespeare was as strong a believer in fate as was Sophocles of old. As a matter of fact, Shakespeare does recognize the existence of what has been variously called, fate, providence, karma,

nemesis, destiny or what you will; he knew life too well not to know that there are some things that, seemingly at least, are beyond human foreknowledge and independent of human control: but he realized as well that man is not the helpless toy or the passive victim of powers beyond mortal ken. Similarly, long before the world knew anything of the theory of evolution or the pseudo-science of eugenics, Shakespeare recognized—as all keen thinkers have recognized—that a man's ancestry and a man's surroundings aid in shaping a man's character. He freely admitted the existence of both fate and heredity, but he was neither a fatalist like Sophocles nor a realist like Ibsen. For, above and beyond all else, he discerned the great fact of human responsibility pointing to the individual will as the dominant factor in the upbuilding or the destroying of honor and chastity and truth. He saw that, in the words of his own Cassius:

“Nor stony tower, nor walls of beaten brass,
Nor airless dungeon nor strong links of iron
Can be retentive to the strength of spirit.”

That oft-quoted passage from Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister*, likening Shakespeare's plays to the book of life with the wind of fate tossing the pages to and fro, is more brilliant and impressive than accurate and felicitous. If fate does move the pages, it cannot alter one jot or one tittle of what is writ thereon.

Shakespeare's prevailing attitude toward the freedom of the will can be gleaned from a study of his plays as a whole, especially from his most representative tragedies, for it is in the serious drama that he can be most readily contrasted with Sophocles and Ibsen. *Œdipus Tyrannus*, *Ghosts* and *King Lear*, vastly different in many respects, have at least one thing in common: each embodies in dramatic form a manifestation of the tragic element in life. *Œdipus* is a tragic figure because he is so poignantly under the dominance of a merciless, inexorable, irresistible fate; *Oswald* is a tragic figure because ancestry and training have made him the pitiable wreck he becomes: In both cases the protagonists are the passive victims of outside forces. But in *Lear* we have a man who goes astray

with wide open eyes and who has chiefly himself to blame for his misfortunes. Lear is none the less tragic because he is the agent of his own undoing—indeed the broken old man on the storm-swept heath is a more heart-rending figure than the broken old man wandering in the grove near Athens—but we gain the distinct impression that his enemies, in a very vital and intimate sense, are those of his own household. The rôle played by Kent in *King Lear* would be unthinkable in either *Edipus Tyrannus* or *Ghosts* because the Theban king and the degenerate son are not responsible for their unhappy lot. Both Kent and the Wonderful Fool in Shakespeare's sublime tragedy exist mainly to serve the dramatic purpose of impressing the spectators with a realization of the fact that Lear's rashness and impetuosity and unfatherly conduct are the true causes of his unhappy plight. The poor old king wrings our heart when he protests that he is a man more sinned against than sinning. Yet, in strict justice, we know that he is sinned against because he has sinned.

Gloucester, in the same drama, is a believer in fate; the same credulous spirit that causes him to believe his son Edgar unfilial makes him attribute all manner of evil to "these late eclipses in the sun and moon." He concludes that it is owing to the dictates of an overruling fate that "love cools, friendship falls off, brothers divide." His mental vision is clouded long before he loses his eyes. But Edmund, villain though he is, makes no such mistake; he laughs at his father's fatalism. "This is the excellent foppery of the world," he comments, "that when we are sick in fortune—often the surfeit of our own behavior—we make guilty of our disasters the sun, the moon, and the stars: as if we were villains by necessity, fools by heavenly compulsion; knaves, thieves and treachers, by spherical predominance; drunkards, liars and adulterers, by an enforced obedience of planetary influence; and all that we are evil in by a divine thrusting on: an admirable evasion of whoremaster man, to lay his goatish disposition to the charge of a star!"

These are the words of a man who knows the world and who, be his moral ideals what they may, is determined to face the

facts of life. Edmund is a self-confessed villain; but he is too clear-sighted to regard himself a villain by necessity; he deliberately chooses his way of life. And when retribution visits him, when "the wheel has come full circle," he sees in it, not the rulings of a whimsical fatality, but the bitter fruits of his own unholy sowing.

And Iago, the cleverest villain of them all, likewise scouts the idea of fatalism and insists upon the supremacy of the individual will. He has looked upon the world for four times seven years and has seen much of both good and ill, and the most practical lesson he has learned is a firm belief in the freedom of the will. "Our bodies are our gardens," he assures the imbecile Roderigo, "to the which our wills are gardeners: so that if we will plant nettles or sow lettuce, set hyssop and weed up thyme, supply it with one gender or herbs or distract it with many, either to have it sterile with idleness or manured with industry, why, the power and corrigible authority of this lies in our wills."

This passage merits more than passing attention, for Shakespeare here puts into the mouth of his supreme scoundrel a fairly adequate expression of his own prevailing attitude toward the freedom of the will. He by no means maintains that a man can escape the consequences of his own deeds—that were not freedom, but chaos; but he does maintain that the ultimate fruition of life is of a man's own choosing. We can sow what we will in the garden of life, and if the crop proves scanty or if it consists only of bitter herbs, we have to blame only the gardener, the human will.

Cassius teaches the same lesson when, urging Brutus to join the conspiracy against Cæsar, he reminds him:

"Men at some time are masters of their fates:
The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
But in ourselves, that we are underlings."

What is this but a reiteration of Iago's declaration "'Tis in ourselves that we are thus or thus."

Shakespeare recognizes the influence of environment, just as he recognizes the influence of fate; but to neither nor to

both does he assign the balance of power in mundane affairs. He shows us both Prince Hal and Falstaff exposed to the emasculating environment of the Eastcheap tavern and pictures the reactions of each, the one rising to heroic heights, the other sinking to the level of a foul-mouthed buffoon. Prince Hal eventually became the virile Henry V who, as has been beautifully said, "flung the English yeomen like a foaming wave over the walls of Harfleur," while Falstaff drifted from worse to worse until we witness the wretched spectacle of his death, the once dashing, fun-loving knight plucking helplessly at the sheets and, as Theobald would have it, babbling of green fields. It was not environment that caused this wide difference between the ultimate careers of the erstwhile boon companions whom Dame Quickly knew so well; "the power and corrigible authority of this" lay in their wills. "Occasions," Thomas à Kempis has sagely said, "do not make the man, but they show what he is."

The problem of temptation is one phase of the general problem of environment. Shakespeare's presentation of it in *Macbeth* lends further illustration of his belief in the supremacy of the human will. The Weird Sisters hail the Thane of Glamis on the blasted heath as temptations come into the life of every man; they represent "supernatural soliciting," not supernatural compulsion. The prophetic salutation, "All hail, Macbeth, that shalt be king hereafter," did not destroy Macbeth's volitional freedom; it did not make him a mere toy of circumstance. He started and seemed to fear things that did sound so fair, because the mysterious words voiced his own long-nurtured thoughts of evil. It is only a superficial reading of the play that finds in the Weird Sisters' greeting Macbeth's first intimation of regicide. Here, as later in the play, Macbeth was determined to "take a bond of fate."

Of theories and counter-theories of *Hamlet* there is literally no end; but all of them turn in some manner or other on the freedom of the will. Whether we consider Hamlet a madman, an invalid, an idealist, a saint or a degenerate; whether we see in him with Goethe an oak tree in a vase, or with Miles

a hero equal to all odds and any emergency, or with Coleridge a thinker whose power of action is lost in the energy of resolve, we are at least convinced that his problem is a problem of volition.

Hamlet, the crowning glory of Shakespeare's genius, is his most superb exposition of the rôle played by the human will in the affairs of men. The motif of this marvelous fusion of thought and action, of tragedy and comedy which, in the words of one of its most brilliant commentators, "resembles some limitless Gothic cathedral with its banners and effigies, its glooms and floods of stained light and echoes of unending dirges," is sounded in a memorable couplet by the many-sided protagonist:

"The time is out of joint. O cursed spite
That ever I was born to set it right!"

Here we have a recognition of the three attitudes maintained by dramatists toward the human will. "The time is out of joint," voices the Ibsen attitude. *Hamlet* admits the fact of an uncongenial environment. Were the author of *Ghosts* to construct a drama on the theme of *Hamlet* the sentence would prove the keynote of the play. And the play itself, we have reason to assume, would concern itself with the tragedy of the Prince of Denmark beating madly against the bars of his limitations and finally falling vanquished, a victim of his environment.

"O cursed spite!" expresses the attitude of Sophocles, the believer in unbending fate. Were *Hamlet* rewritten in the spirit of the author of the *Oedipus* trilogy, the Ghost, as the symbol of destiny, would assume a leading part in the play. The supernatural mandate would fall with crushing force on the bowed head of the protagonist who, in his melancholy suits of solemn black would pace through the play aimless, hopeless, helpless, driven to his doom by forces over which he had no control, or else vainly flee from what was to be, even as Orestes of old sought to escape the unrelenting Furies.

But the note of personal freedom, of selective will, plainly

enters into the line, "That ever I was born to set it right," and becomes, under Shakespeare's treatment, the dominant theme. The work of setting right the time is given to the Prince of Denmark, even as some life work is given to every man born into the world. His specific problem—and a multi-faceted problem it proves to be—turns upon the manner of setting it right. Hamlet is given pause, not because he sees no way out of his difficulty, but because he sees so many ways. He must make up his mind; he must exercise his freedom of will. Hamlet waiting on the platform at Elsinore to meet the Ghost, Hamlet planning the play scene, Hamlet venting the torrents of his bitterness and woe upon the gentle Ophelia, Hamlet reproaching his mother, Hamlet observing the king at prayer, Hamlet wrestling with Laertes in Ophelia's grave, Hamlet engaged in the fatal game of foils—all these are vital steps in the development of the play, and every one of them turns upon a free, deliberate act of Hamlet's will. The "divinity that shapes our ends" has naught to do with the rough-hewing of the acts that make or mar our life work.

It need hardly be said that Shakespeare's attitude toward the freedom of the will—an attitude which is broad enough to take into account the fact of providence and the play of circumstances without attributing to either or to both the supreme and unalterable function of fashioning the career of the individual man—is one that commends itself both in the light of Christian teaching and in view of the practical affairs of daily life. Here as elsewhere, Shakespeare tells the truth. It is deeply significant that Shakespeare's professed fatalists and extreme believers in the force of environment are not one of them of heroic mold. His Edmunds and Iagos, on the other hand, are champions of volitional freedom; and though villains, they are at all events men of action. Ruskin, it will be remembered, maintained that Shakespeare has many heroines, but not one hero. Among those many heroines, it is difficult to find a solitary fatalist; Rosalind, Imogen, Beatrice, Isabella unanimously agree with Helena that

"Our remedies oft in ourselves do lie,
Which we ascribe to heaven: the fated sky
Gives us free scope; only doth backward pull
Our slow designs when we ourselves are dull."

BROTHER LEO, F. S. C.

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE,
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA.

INSTRUCTION IN SEX HYGIENE.

The movement to introduce instruction in matters of sex into the curriculum of public schools, though strongly advocated as early as the eighteenth century by the German educationist Basedow, has only within very recent years become at all general. Such a step marks a long advance from the simple plan originally devised for our common educational institutions, but is only another expression of a prevailing purpose to establish in the school the theatre for the discharge of duties and offices that venerable tradition has heretofore restricted to the secluded precincts of the home.

That the manner and measure of imparting this instruction present no little difficulty is generally recognized. But it is not with any pedagogical problem that we are here directly concerned. Rather would we address ourselves to the moral aspect of the movement—an aspect involving confessedly the most vital consequences.

Of the havoc wrought by sexual immorality there can be no question. The statistics that would give us an approximate estimate of the physical evils due to the vice enable us to gather but a faint idea of its moral devastation. The disease surely cries for a remedy. And we are told that an effective remedy is at hand in the instruction which it is proposed should be introduced into our schools, regarding the nature and functions of the reproductive organs, their hygiene and the terrible issues following upon their abuse.

It will be noted at the outset that such a plan is of piece with the ethics of our modern day naturalism—the ethics that would submit all the springs and purposes of life to the scrutiny of the laboratory, thence to gather motives and sanctions sufficient for the purity and guidance of morals. The word morals is here, however, out of place. We should for great exactness use the word hygiene. For it is hygiene that is the norm of

action this new education would establish. "I confess that I am not moral" complacently observed a young man, one of the first fruits of this social reformation, "but I am hygienic." The cynicism of the remark cannot blind us to its logical pertinence. For what other attitude can be expected when the physiological aspects of one of the most sacred functions of life are so accentuated and the motives for sexual purity become identified with considerations of physical sanitation.

But confining ourselves to the narrow question of the specific proposed, we do not hesitate to affirm that the suggested instruction is thoroughly inadequate to afford the remedy sought. While illuminative, it is not operative. "Video meliora proboque—deteriora sequor" says Ovid, and we are warranted in concluding to the insufficiency of this kind of enlightenment alone to check indulgence from observing the results that ordinarily follow upon the efforts that are made to prevent boys from contracting the habit of smoking. A drop of nicotine, they are told, is capable of killing a dog. Yet while not formally rejected the warning proves of little avail. Again striking accounts are given in the text-books of physiology, commonly used in our schools, of the havoc wrought upon the human organism by alcohol. We have yet to hear, however, of any extended expressions of complacency over the measure of restraint brought about merely by means of such representations.

Now we would not be understood as discountenancing all instruction whatever in sexual life. Some direction is necessary, but even though there were the motive power in merely intellectual enlightenment, which we deny, such direction would not require the elaborate and technical knowledge urged by most of our modern hygienists. According to Havelock Ellis one who would adequately fill the role of teacher in this proposed department of education must among other wide accomplishments "have a sufficient knowledge of the facts of sexual psychology, sexual physiology, and sexual pathology, knowledge which, in many important respects, hardly existed at all until recently and is only now beginning to become generally accessible."¹

¹ Havelock Ellis: *The Task of Social Hygiene*, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1912, p. 250.

It would be interesting to know just what the author quoted has in mind as constituting a "sufficient knowledge" in the above named branches. We are warranted in inferring it to be a special scholarship, so special as quite to require the training of a physician. Indeed, according to Dr. Mall the ordinary physician is not fully equipped for the task: this writer informing us that "the very persons to whom to-day we have to look to effect the sexual enlightenment of children are themselves, to a great extent, also in need of enlightenment: and in respect of many of the questions about which the child has to be enlightened no general harmony of scientific opinion can as yet be said to obtain."²

Because of the lack of unanimity among the scientific, Dr. Mall expresses himself as sceptical regarding the results of sexual education. He instances as occasioning controversy—the question whether or not the secret sin is in certain circumstances physiological; again, whether or not sexual abstinence is detrimental to health. Yet even though these questions, as others that bear upon the sex problem, might be recognized as settled according to the sense of the great majority of representative physicians, the ends that it is sought to accomplish through the proposed instruction would to no appreciable extent be advanced. And this for the simple reason that the means to this end are to be found not in an increased measure of intellectual illumination but in an increment of moral strength, not in greater light but in ampler power. They are to be discovered in a strengthening and development of the will.³ Now like every other faculty the will can gain the

² Dr. Albert Mall: *The Sexual Life of the Child*. English translation by Eden Paul, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1912, p. 303.

³ The dramatic production of Brieux entitled "Damaged Goods (*Les Avaries*), which of late has created quite a sensation in New York and Washington, has been hailed as showing in a most eloquent way the necessity and efficacy of intellectual enlightenment to stay the plague of sexual immorality. Yet the futility of mere knowledge as a moral deterrent could hardly be more palpably set forth than it is in this play. The whole of the first act is taken up with a dialogue between a physi-

qualities of firmness and vigor only by pursuit of what is its distinctive object and by adherence to this object once it is attained. The good being the term of the will's action we recognize in what must consist the general manner and measure of this faculty's true education. In the question we are considering this training is secured by the realization and acceptance of the morally good. But by moral good we would signify something more than the hygienist ordinarily understands by the words. We would take it in the sense of a conformity to a norm of action prescribed by a personal God. This connotes an idea of obedience—an idea to which the Apostle refers when he writes the Thessalonians: "This is the will of God, your sanctification: that you should abstain from fornication, that every one of you should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honour; not in the passion of lust, like the Gentiles who know not God." ⁴

As correlative with the foregoing concept there necessarily occurs the thought of sin. And it is precisely here that we come upon a notion of which our frail youth stand eminently in need. Yes, our boys and girls require to be convinced of the nature, the enormity, the ravages of sin. In such a conviction will be found a motive and deterrent that all the considerations drawn from sociology, psychology, physiology and pathology are thoroughly incapable of supplying. These latter have a place of course, but anterior to them all must be the constraining thought that "neither fornicators, nor adulterers, nor the effeminate nor liars with mankind . . . shall possess the Kingdom of God." ⁵

We recognize that we are here adducing motives that will

cian and a patient in which the latter is made to understand clearly the character of his disease and the moral obligation resting upon him to abstain from marriage for a certain period. But the injunction to defer wedlock laid down with all impressiveness is disregarded.

Again in the second act the grandmother is made aware of the dread results that threaten the nurse from suckling the infected infant. Such information, however, is impotent to check the purpose of the grandparent, the nurse being saved only by the warnings of the physician.

⁴ I Thess. iv, 3 *sqq.*

⁵ I Cor. iv, 9.

be accorded small measure of efficacy in the ethics of our present day naturalism. Together with the religion whence they spring they will be reckoned as "such stuff as dreams are made of." But such an estimate is made possible only by the fact that our naturalistic philosophers fail to bear in mind the effect which just these religious considerations have had upon the society in which they live. It is because these motives still hold sway even to an extent of which society itself is generally unconscious, that the baneful character of the principles and morals of naturalism are not at present more generally discovered. As yet there is about these latter an academic aloofness. They are thriving in the attenuated atmosphere of the study. But once let them become vitalized, once let them supplant to a wide extent the religious springs of action that have prevailed thus far and we will have a practical demonstration of their pernicious quality which all the arguments from the arm-chair will be powerless to obscure. Then from their evil fruits will we know how to appraise unfailingly the ethics that would cry out for emancipation from the ancient restraints of a disavowed religion.

Of course, we do not forget that many who advocate instruction of children in the physiology and hygiene of the sexual life would disavow the principles of naturalism. But it is only through the extensive influence of these principles that this general movement finds its due explanation. And this not so much because naturalism would seek to bring about a moral reform through mental enlightenment, but because it would eliminate as impelling motives all considerations other than those afforded by the natural law as such. These, as far as they go, are excellent. But we affirm that for the great mass of humanity they are and ever will be morally inadequate to encompass the end of which it is here question. Examples of this insufficiency are readily available. Instance the results following upon the earnest efforts of the eugenists to arouse in our society a greater sense of responsibility to the duties of parenthood. The glories of maternity, the duties that every woman owes to society, the social consequences that must ensue

if the role of motherhood is spurned or even in small measure slighted, were never so eloquently or so persistently set forth. But how meagre is the fruit of all these appeals we know. We are told that the shunning of the office is easily traceable to the inordinate love of ease and indulgence which pervades our modern life. Just so, but from this sensuous gratification our society is to be effectively aroused, not by information regarding its social obligations, not by thought of the natural dignity of motherhood, but by an awakened response to the old traditional motives of religion. And the best proof of this is to be found in the fact, that it is owing precisely to the neglect and scorn of these motives that the conditions rightly recognized as the fertile source of the evil deplored have come about.

Similarly, reason clearly dictates that we should hold imperiously in check our animal passions. This is seen to be a very fundamental prescription of the natural order. Nevertheless, if we are to appraise duly the constraining power of this ordinance, we must view it not as an abstract principle but as an actual motive in every day life. We will then recognize that with humanity in the mass, with its primitive and overweening passions this injunction of reason is thoroughly insufficient. No, the flesh and blood of this humanity must know and feel a power greater than itself, a power capable of raising it out of itself if it is not to succumb continually to its animal instincts. This power positive religion, with its sanctions alone, is capable of supplying. Says Prof. Foerster: "There are certainly a number of highly rational arguments against pleasure seeking, selfishness and passion, but when pitted against the elemental forces of life, they are seen to be powerless—at any rate in the case of strong and passionate natures. For such the belief in a higher and eternal life is alone able to overcome the enticements of our life in the flesh."⁶

⁶ F. W. Foerster: *Marriage and the Sex Problem*. New York, Frederick A. Stokes Co. We would commend this work most highly. With the exception of an inexcusable passing reference to indulgences it sets forth the Catholic doctrine regarding the Sex-Problem admirably well. The chapter on "The Indispensability of the Ascetic Ideal" is particularly praiseworthy.

Again it will not be difficult to inculcate the truth that the laws of Nature cannot be violated without grave consequences. But the mills of God grind slowly, and the penalty that awaits the offender is readily recognized as being generally too distant to arouse the fear necessary to create an effective motive of restraint. Venereal diseases follow quickly, it is true, upon certain impure relations: but even those needing least any information regarding the character of such disorders easily persuade themselves that they will be of the number that will escape the dread contamination. Once the idea of sin is realized, however, the sanction behind offended law is seen to be inevitable. "If any man violate the temple of God, him shall God destroy."⁷ "Wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doth evil."⁸ This thought gaining harborage there comes a sense of personal responsibility and a deterring influence no other source can furnish.

We have said that we are to look for the remedy against sexual impurity in moral strength and consequently in the mastery of the will over the sensuous appetite. This entails, however, a constant and unremitting warfare. For while the rational faculty would seek what redounds to the weal of human nature as a whole, the lower appetites, regardless of this general welfare, would strive to indulge unrestrained the gratification of the senses. Hence it is that "the flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh." The insubordination of the lower faculties to the dictates of reason constitute, it is clear, an inherent weakness of human nature. "I find then a law; that where I have a will to do good, evil is present with me. For I am delighted with the law of God, according to the inward man: but I see another law in my members, fighting against the law of my mind, and captivating me in the law of sin, that is in my members. Unhappy man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death."⁹

The unruly desire of the "members" against the "mind"

⁷ 1 Cor. III, 17.

⁸ Rom. II, 8.

⁹ Rom. VII, 21-25.

is specifically known as concupiscence and though declared to be sin by Luther and the Reformers it is not such. It is, indeed, so styled by St. Paul, but this only in the sense that it is the result of sin and to sin is a most potent allurements. It becomes imputable as moral wrong only when it gains to its movements the consent of the will. And according to the measure in which this faculty resists the undue impulses and longings of the flesh will its power and ascendancy be established as on the other hand weakness and final enslavement await inevitably upon its compliance with these cravings. In this conflict, moreover, the will can hope to escape the captivity, spoken of by the Apostles, not by direct assault or repulse, but only by flight. The voice of the tempter is so alluring that only by getting away from its sound can safety be gained. No one having had the least experience in the care of souls needs to be told this. Nor is such manner of acting called for only in time of pressing temptation. The smouldering embers of the masterful passion must, as much as possible, be allowed to remain unshaken. They would certainly be stirred up, however, in the case of the young by the analysis and discussion of the sexual life and its processes. Inevitably there would ensue upon such instruction a titillation of the senses and a stimulation of the imagination which would seduce the will before the evil effects of passion could be realized.

Let it not be supposed that in turning away the mind of the young from thought of the reproductive system the hope is entertained for a moment of eliminating all sexual stimuli. This thoroughly absurd idea, it would appear, is attributed by the hygienists to those who oppose their plans. "We must clearly realize at the outset," says Dr. Mall, "that the complete exclusion of sexual stimuli in the education of children is impossible,"¹⁰ and Havelock Ellis observes that: "Games and physical exercises induce in many cases a considerable degree of sexual stimulation. But this need not cause us undue alarm, nor must we thereby be persuaded to change our policy of recom-

¹⁰ Mall, *op. cit.*, p. —

mending such games and exercises.”¹¹ Very true, but there is no question here of such exclusion, there is question only of mastery. And this, we submit for reasons given, our children will not gain by being told, in their class-rooms, about the nature and the workings of these stimuli. Sexual activities of course are not eliminated when the attention is diverted from them, but the evil suggestiveness they ordinarily would have for the youthful imagination is precluded.

It is argued, however, that right information is required to counteract the misrepresentations which are so frequently imparted by vicious associates. But just here we come upon an effective argument against the introduction of the proposed instruction into the schools. For the subject of the class-room discussion, though it be ever so skilfully and delicately presented, will be later called up by the depraved as a theme upon which to exercise their scurrility and mischievous wit. True, children of this kind need not to be prompted to discover their evil thoughts; nevertheless, they will not fail to avail themselves of the opportunity thus presented to give a wider play to their degrading influence. But it may be contended, after the sound instruction of the school, the power to mislead will be taken from these children. This would be true if the latter induced the innocent to wrong through psychological, physiological or pathological error. This, however, is ordinarily not the case. The evil is accomplished for the most part, not by misinforming and deceiving the intellect, but by arousing passion through representations offered to susceptible imaginations. And this can be brought about not merely through the erroneous ideas but likewise through the exact information which the vicious may publish. And that this class possesses

¹¹ Havelock Ellis, *op. cit.*, p. 246. We are not sure what games Mr. Ellis has here in mind. We have assumed that he means healthy outdoor exercise. If however, he would embrace by the term what passes for games at many social functions or “parties,” attended by the tender young of both sexes, we would strongly affirm that there is need for alarm since the effect of such games is to accelerate the development of the sexual instinct. And this should be ever studiously avoided.

a large fund of such information cannot be denied. Successful resistance then is conditioned, as a rule, not upon the possession of a body of accurate knowledge but upon the developed strength of will.

We have said that the influence of evil associates is not ordinarily owing to the power which these possess to vitiate the mind. We have thus qualified our statement, because we have in view certain false teachings that have had pernicious practical results. Mention has already been made of these in the extract quoted from the work of Dr. Mall. According to this teaching the secret sin is in certain stages of development purely physiological and continency in particular instances is detrimental to health. It will be recognized that the origin of these opinions is to be attributed not to the depraved company against which we would in a special manner warn our children, but to some members of the medical profession. This it is that gives to them a large measure of evil potency. With discussion of them we need not be detained. Fortunately, they have come to be universally repudiated by the more reputable physicians. We would observe, moreover, that though error such as this cannot but have baneful results, in practice the successful and thorough discountenancing of it, as we have already pointed out, affords no positive remedy against sexual immorality.

Largely as a consequence of the foregoing teaching is the idea current to some extent that mastery over the movements of concupiscence is at times impossible. This opinion may, indeed be regarded as the popular form which such doctrines could not but inevitably take on. And as this idea must needs lead to the enslavement of the will, so too must it gain increase of strength from the resulting subserviency of this faculty to the flesh. So it is that the debauchee fails to realize that others who have early and habitually exercised the restraints which he never practiced can possess a power of self-control to which he has become a stranger. Hence the insinuations, if not open charges, we so often hear coming from such a one against the celibate state; hence too the easy tolerance shown in many

quarters towards sexual immorality just so long as certain external forms of conventional propriety are not violated. Clearly then the doctrine that the promptings of the lower faculties can be successfully and habitually resisted must be studiously inculcated upon the young. But this is by no means sufficient. For again what avail is it all if one knows that he can gain the mastery over his animal passions if such mastery he does not gain. Over and above a pedagogy of the mind there is here required a sound pedagogy of the will and hence the necessity of recurrence to the principles we have endeavored briefly to set forth.

We have said that the best natural safeguards against sexual immorality was to divert the attention from the concupiscence of the flesh. And this suggests the rôle played by the sense of shame. The instructive characteristic of this sentiment should be accepted as an *a priori* evidence of its high value. It must have a function for which the intellect of itself is insufficient. We recognize such purpose in the case of other deeply rooted instincts. We know, for instance, that reason demands that every individual should take all available means to preserve his life, yet over and above this prescription is the impulse of instinct supplying the deficiency which in many a contingency would arise from the tardy workings of the higher faculty. We perceive, too, that the good of society requires that brother and sister should not entertain for each other the kind of sentiment that would prompt to their intermarriage. Reason would point out the evil consequences that would ensue, could such affection arise between those growing up together in the intimate association of the home. But anterior to the revelations of reason and precluding the danger that would result from waiting upon its discursive process, a providential instinct repels from these attachments. So in the instinct of shame we should find a preservative of purity—a preservative which reason unaided would often be too slow to afford. This in fact is the case. For this instinct puts a check to that freedom of speech and action which would incite to passion before the warnings of reason could be heard.

Again, it is recognized that the reproductive system has a most noble function. But this function is a social one. It is not primarily for the individual, it is for the race. Yet this view is realized only when the higher faculties are able to rise superior to the promptings of the flesh. This, however, will be morally impossible if the marital act and all that is naturally referable to it are freely and openly discussed. For in anything like an unhampered interchange of thought on the subject the imagination becoming inflamed and the will being captivated what should be regarded principally in the light of its high social purpose will come to be reckoned only as a means of individual gratification. Against the source of this overweening excitation must be arrayed, therefore, a barrier which is independent of the higher faculties. Such a hindrance is found in the instinct of shame.¹²

From this we may easily infer the answer that is to be made to Havelock Ellis when speaking of the doctrine opposed to what he would advocate on this question he tells us, "it is a theory that walks on two feet, pointing opposite ways: sex things must not be talked about because they are dirty; sex things must not be talked about because they are sacred."¹³ That the so-called "sex things" are in a sense sacred, at least according to Catholic doctrine, there is no denying. The state of wedlock, in which only the generative act is legitimate, is a holy one, inaugurated in Catholic practice by a Sacrament. In a broad sense the act by which a human being is formed, necessitating as it does a particular concurrence of God, in the creation of an immortal soul, cannot but be looked upon as something sacred. But it is not because of this character

¹² It is a matter for surprise that even scientific writers should be so entirely oblivious of the scientific truth that very deeply rooted instincts invariably have some fundamental biological function to discharge. The mere intellect may not always understand what these functions are, for the very good reason that they may be intended as barriers to the intellect itself; they may serve to protect our most important vital processes from the dangers which threaten them through an excess of conscious attention."
—Foerster, *op. cit.*, p. 185-186.

¹³ Havelock Ellis, *op. cit.*, p. 247.

that there is thrown about the act and what immediately relates to it, a veil of secrecy. No, it is absolutely untrue to say that the reason alleged for not speaking about "things of sex" is the fact that they are sacred. If they were only this, no such silence would be imposed. The reason is elsewhere. For, besides being to an extent sacred, the generative function is physiological with such a passional content that while pure and undefiled within marriage, it cannot be generally discussed without imminent danger of arousing concupiscence. It is for this reason, and not because "things of sex" are in themselves sinful or "dirty," that they are not talked about. And for the more effective prevention of such perilous communication there exists the deep-rooted instinct we have described.

The sense of shame, as here understood, is we know reckoned of small value by our modern hygienists. And this for two reasons. It is, we are informed, but a relic of a discarded dogma according to which the sexual impulse is sinful. Originating thus in a false and pernicious tenet, this religious taboo is perpetuated by a no less false and pernicious conventionality. The other reason is to be found in the character of this feeling. It is morbid, springing from a false modesty and finding no warrant therefore in anything like healthy-mindedness. It is called prudery, and so stigmatized comes in for utter repudiation.

We have already referred to the error which would declare that concupiscence is in itself something sinful. As we said it was a cardinal doctrine of Luther and the reformers of the sixteenth century. But long before the dawn of Protestantism it was clearly involved in the baneful teachings of a certain branch of the Gnostics as later on in that of the Manicheans. It has always been condemned by the Church and the implication that it has been discountenanced only in our day, must be set down to ignorance or disregard of historical facts. It is unrelated to the idea that the sexual appetite is in itself sinful and such a contention is as unwarrantable as the various other theories that have been advanced by the naturalistic writers to account for its origin. The Sense of Shame of which we are

speaking is owing to the insubordination of the lower to the higher faculties. It is natural and intrinsic, in no wise the outcome of convention or conspiracy. And the proposal boldly advocated by some to speak unrestrainedly about the sexual life and its functions, opposed as it is to the compelling action of this radical instinct, must be dispatched as not only pernicious but nugatory.

But as there is a genuine so there is a spurious modesty. And it is this latter only we are told that would stand in the way of the proposed instruction in sex hygiene. That prudery merits the full measure of condemnation and of contempt as well, so generally given it, cannot be denied. It is to true modesty what the humility of the Uriah Heep kind is to the real virtue. For just as a parading obsequiousness is made to cover over an unduly sensitive self esteem, so the guise of modesty may often be assumed to hide a morbid consciousness developed from too much reflection upon the sexual life. "Is that statue immodest," was asked Johnson on a certain occasion, "No, but your inquiry is," was the prompt response. And so it might well have been. But this counterfeit shame, an artificial and vitiated growth, must not be allowed to discredit the character and office of the instinct of pure nature we have above described and which we insist would suffer violence by the instruction our hygienists would advocate.

Only less repellent than prudery is the absence of all delicate reserve regarding sex matters. While there is not in this latter, the content of shame generally associated with its opposite extreme, nevertheless in the case of womankind more particularly it is subversive of the charms that nature designed should be the portion of the gentler sex. Maiden modesty is more than a mere theme of poets. It has not only a protective value, as we have seen, but in constituting an attraction peculiar to sex it fills a rôle truly biological. But such reserve must necessarily be lost if in the class-room the girl of tender and susceptible years is made to listen to an analysis and discussion of a subject which according to all the promptings of her nature she would restrict to a matter of confidence with a sympathetic parent.

Finally, in the light of the contention that moral power is necessary to subdue the rebellion of our lower nature, we cannot but read a condemnation of the analogies continually drawn by the advocates of sex instruction between the reproductive process in man and the lower animals. Such assimilations are admittedly but part and parcel of the doctrine that would trace all instincts and emotions of humanity back to a "prehuman ancestry."¹⁴ Into any discussion of that doctrine we are not called upon to enter here. We wish only to insist upon the total inadequacy of such considerations as would disregard the specific distinction marking off man from the lower creation to supply a sufficient check to sexual impulses. In catching up this idea of the artistic element, in animal courtship, in characterizing human love as a refined elaboration by means of evolution of the amatory passion that flows up through that of the fishes, of the birds and the higher mammals, we are looking for an ideal of conduct in a fatally wrong direction. No, our appeal must be made to a different court entirely. It must be presented to the spiritual nature in man—a nature that raises him to a thoroughly different order than that within which must ever range, the creatures below him. The lessons, then, which our hygienists would draw from animal physiology and life¹⁵ necessarily tend to blind the mind to the source whence only can be found the strength to master the lower appetites.

In this diversion from the spiritual element, setting man apart from the lower order of existences, we read a contempt for the character and practice of asceticism. This form of self-conquest must, we are told, be put aside as violently unnatural.

¹⁴ Say Thomson and Geddis: "To those at all acquainted with one of the most fascinating chapters in the natural history of the year, it cannot but seem strangely unobserving or pharasaic when men or women resent any analogy between animal-love and their own. In the first place we cannot deny our lineage even though we may not be able to point to any of its precise links. . . ." *Problems of Sex*, New York, Moffat, Yard and Co., 1912.

¹⁵ As for instance in the story of the two colts in Winfield S. Hall's: *From Youth to Manhood*, p. 43, *et seq.*

It is dehumanizing, the fruit of it all being, as Havelock Ellis would say, ineffective angels rather than effective men and women. And right here we come upon an idea that has been more conducive to immorality than any other influence. This is the notion that the restraint aimed at and attained by the ascetics is to be looked upon as above the power of reasonable effort; that it is too much to expect of ordinary flesh and blood. The necessary issue of such a thought has been a relaxation of sustained struggle against native appetites and a consequent breaking down of what only could afford a barrier to the imperious onslaught of sensuality. To vindicate here the character and workings of asceticism would lead us beyond the scope of this article. Suffice it is to say with Professor Foerster that it "should be regarded not as a negation of nature nor as an attempt to extirpate natural forces but as practice in the art of self-discipline."¹⁶ The realization that the essence of such discipline is in perfect conformity with a duly balanced life and that by it the spiritual powers of man can be enabled to maintain an habitual even though disputed sway over his lower faculties is a prerequisite condition to anything like an effective general movement looking to the restraint of sexual immorality.

As indicated at the beginning of this paper our criticism has been immediately directed against the plan to introduce instruction in sex matters into the curriculum of our common schools. We would not, however, be charged with desiring to shut off from the young all enlightenment and direction regarding their sexual life. But the place for such information and guidance is the home. And even here the method of instruction should largely be an indirect one. We have seen that education to purity involves primarily and essentially a question of power—a power which is to be developed, not so much by the exercise of strength elicited only when necessary to resist the rebellion of sexual passion, but by a larger round of habitual self-restraint issuing in an ever-growing sovereignty of the moral faculties. The regime submitted by many of our hygienists regarding diet, baths, out-door exercise, regular hours, sleep

¹⁶ Foerster: *op. cit.*, p. 128.

and personal appearance must, therefore, be heartily approved. The faithful observance of such a regime besides its undeniable good effects on physical health, affords a discipline that must make for the upbuilding of moral character.

All this, however, is subsidiary to religious instruction, for it is religion, as we have pointed out, that is to supply the motives and sanctions that are to be the effectual checks to the evil we would stay. And as in the home the child first learns to lisp God's name, so is it there that the unfolding mind and heart are to be inculcated with the lasting idea of the heinousness of sin and of the seduction which on all sides await but to seduce from obedience to an Eternal Judge. True, it must be confessed the awful responsibilities here involved are in many instances but too poorly realized by those upon whom they necessarily fall. And just for this reason very largely sexual impurity has become so alarmingly general.

But what now of the instruction, to be given in the home and directly bearing upon sex hygiene?

We do not hesitate to say that such instruction is not to be at all of the extensive and elaborate kind that we might be led to think was necessary from the present literature on the subject. While not condemning the accounts given in such books as "What a Young Boy Ought to Know" to the childish query "Where did I come from," we think they ordinarily arouse more curiosity than they allay. Nor would we repudiate the stork story which has lately come into rather wide disrepute. Such a representation is to be put upon much the same level as that of Jack the Giant Killer and of the other Jack of the Bean Stalk. The growing child soon learns that it was not meant to deceive but to stop an inquisitiveness that might not well be indulged. Of course the critical age of puberty calls for especial attention and guidance. Understanding sufficiently the nature of the new phase that life takes on at this period, the sympathetic parent will strive to prevent the flood of vague feelings and emotions aroused in the child from taking the morbid bents to which they would often incline. The possible disquietude caused by the first appearance of certain physiolo-

gical processes will be duly allayed. Finally, the consequences following upon the indulgence of the secret sin will be made known, though for this anything like scientific discursiveness is uncalled for. Such is the amount of direct instruction, supposing the moral character otherwise developed, that will ordinarily be needed.

We have sufficiently referred to the power and influence of the Church to lessen the sexual evil when we spoke of the necessity and efficacy of religious sanctions and motives. We would say but a word in concluding of the particular potency resident in the confessional. In this tribunal not only the sin itself but the causes and occasions that have induced and encouraged it are unreservedly laid bare. It is here that the conditions modifying moral responsibility are best discovered. And this the confessor, at once spiritual father and physician, addressing himself to the peculiar weakness, liabilities and special temptations of the penitent, is enabled to afford a remedy which in its specific character is dowered with largest promise of healing and health.

JOHN W. MELODY.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Mediæval Musical Relics of Denmark, by Angul Hammerich.
Translated from Danish by Margaret William Hamerik.
Leipzig, Breitkopf & Haertel, 1912. In-4o, pp. viii + 126.

Although of foreign inspiration and publication, this book deserves a hearty welcome in its English translation. For, our English literature is so desperately poor in Gregorian science and matters thereto related, that any new piece of information about the subject takes the proportions of a revelation, at least for those who are not able to read foreign books in the original, that is to say, for the great majority of readers.

In truth, the present book does not deal with the majestic Gregorian repertory proper, but with elements of transition between the golden age of plain-chant and the music of modern times; eleven sequences or so-called proses, two hymns, and two hymn-like songs, all pieces of a popular character.

The sequence had a glorious life from the 10th to the 16th centuries. Born of the Gregorian chant, it was one of the factors that gave birth, after a long evolution, to the modern popular melody. Numberless sequences were composed and came into frequent use during the mediæval period, many of them being more remarkable in both the poetical and the musical aspects. But sequences were novelties, and works of private inspiration; and their texts, instead of being taken from Sacred sources as was the case for the bulk of the old liturgical repertory, were personal creations unsanctioned by legitimate authority, and, in some way, similar to our modern hymns in the vernacular; and, instead of keeping, as the latter, an extra-liturgical character and position, they showed a marked tendency to become an official part of the liturgical music. Hence arose difficulties and abuses, which finally were eliminated by the total suppression of sequences, with the exception of five only, that are still kept in our Catholic repertory. One of them, *Lauda Sion salvatorem*, has exactly the same melody as the sequence *Lux iocunda lux insignis*, reproduced and analysed in Mr. Hammerich's book. Likewise, his sequence *Ab arce siderea*

is musically about the same as the sequence *Exultet Ecclesia*, sung in the diocese of Paris on the feast of the patron St. Dionysius.

Condensed within a few pages, much information of great interest will be found in the first chapter of this book, about the origin and history of sequences, their older and newer textual forms, their musical structure, and other points. A second chapter treats of their primitive notation, rhythm, practical rendering, and transcription into modern musical notation.

After these preliminary generalities, the author comes to the scientific discussion of the musical pieces under examination. He makes his own the principle of the Benedictines of Solesmes in their *Paléographie Musicale*; no basis but "the sources." His sources are: 1° the *Liber Daticus Lundensis*, 12th century; 2° the *Liber Scolæ Virginis*, 14th cent.; 3° the *Codex Germanicus 786 Munich*, 15th cent.; 4° the *Codex Kiloniensis*, 13th cent.; 5° a Paper ms., Arne Magn. Collection, Univ. Libr. Copenhagen, 15th cent.; 6° the *Piæ Cantiones*, Finnish-Swedish song-book, 16th century. Number 1 supplies the sequences: *Ab arce siderea, Lux iocunda lux insignis, Alleluia nunc decantet*; n° 2, the sequences: *Missus Gabriel de celis I, Letabundus exultet fidelis chorus, Gaude Maria templum summe trinitatis, Jubilemus in hac die, A rea virga prime matris Eue*; n° 3, the sequence: *Missus Gabriel de celis II*; n° 4, the hymns *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia, Primo proscriptos patria*, and the sequences *Preciosa mors sanctorum, Diem festum ueneremur martyris*; n° 6, the *Carmen Vernale, In vernalis temporis*. All these pieces may be read in the original notation, as the book gives facsimiles of the sources for each of them. And, of course, the sources first are verified, then the facsimiles with their special materials are discussed and analysed on account of the origin and history, text, tonality, melody, rhythm, use, etc.; and their transcription is made into modern musical notation. The whole work is a model of scientific accurateness.

Perhaps a slight objection may be raised about the transcription into modern musical notation as it figures in the book. In fact, when the Benedictine monks of Solesmes give such transcriptions of Gregorian chant, they take scrupulously into account the principle of the primary beat, or primary unit, which, in old music, adjusted all the time-values to the minimum value, that is to say, to the single note in music and the short syllable in speech; and they choose their primary unit in the modern system of notation,

usually the eighth-note or quaver; and, whatever may be the apparent monotony of the new writing, they stick to their principle, and put a quaver for each single note as well as for each integral element of neums or groups, trusting to the unisonic duplications of tones, the *moræ ultimæ vocum* suggested by crotchets, the so-called rhythmical signs, the influence of the tonic accent or text-phrasing, and the experience of singers, for the introduction of the due variety and for the vitalization of the melodies. Now, Mr. Hammerich is at home in everything relating to Gregorian rhythms and knows all the controversies of the past and the present, and even chooses (p 10) to "agree with the Benedictine theory"; but he dares not reduce his faith to sweeping practice: for, in transcribing his manuscripts into modern notation, he uses quarter-notes or crotchets for the single notes, and eighth-notes or quavers from the grouped notes of neums. To be consistent, however, he gives us warning that "this rhythm in reality is timeless, and the notes must not therefore be misunderstood as representing fixed rhythmic values." All that would be well if every reader were able to understand this warning and to keep it in mind irrevocably. But, and here is the trouble, the great majority of readers will overlook or forget it, or will be unable to grasp its import; and the imperfect transcription is here, and will mislead everybody, even the best musicians, so imperious is the prestige of time-value in modern notation. A proof of this assertion is at hand in the book itself. Its Supplement gives a harmonization in four vocal parts of the sequence *Ab arce siderea* and of the *Carmen Vernale*, written by Professor Julius Röntgen. As the modern metric $\frac{3}{4}$ is supposed to be genuine for the latter piece, all is well for it. But what about the first one, which decidedly is an instance of free rhythm? Prof. Julius Röntgen, with the exception of a few passages in which some slight details are adapted by him to modern accentuation or to harmonic needs, takes the sequence with its rhythm as figured by the time-values of Mr. Hammerich's transcription; and he creates for it a very clever harmonization in true polyphonic style. Now, such a musical work, interesting as it may be, does away with any possibility of free rhythm: for, canonic imitations, as well as contrapuntal combinations of two or three notes against one, require a strict observance of the written time-values as soon as we come to a practical rendering.

It would be untimely, however, to insist on the foregoing objec-

tion. All told, the book, as a whole, is very remarkable, and will be of great interest to anybody who likes to inquire about the music of the past. And this is no small merit, granted that the chaotic position in which so many questions of musical archeology are still involved makes it extremely difficult to write about them in a manner which may please the majority of readers.

Mr. Hammerich closes his volume with a list of some seventy books of reference. Unfortunately, only five of them are published in English. When will our publishers start the work of translation and publication of some of those substantial books which compel the attention of the intellectual world on the other side of the Atlantic? Nobody knows! Publishers object that there is no demand for such books; and readers object that there are in English no such books to ask for: so, we are turning in a vicious circle. It is full time to act, if we would escape from it before the day of judgment.

ABEL L. GABERT.

The Lyric Year. Edited by Ferdinand Earle. Mitchell Kennerly, New York, 1912.

Over in England they have already learned to speak of the Victorian bards in that tone of polite contempt and depreciation which is more natural than proper in discussion the merits of our grandfathers and their times. And already the young poets and the young critics are hailing the Georgian Era as the dawn of a glorious day for English poetry. May their hopes have speedy and rich fulfilment. Meanwhile, we cannot help wishing the evidences they offer were as strong as their enthusiasm.

On this side the Atlantic, our poets, like the bards of old, have been competing for prizes. From ten thousand poems submitted by two thousand poets in one of these competitions, Mr. Ferdinand Earle, the donor of the prizes, has selected the hundred pieces which compose "The Lyric Year."

Unfortunately, we do not find ourselves able to greet our poets with the enthusiasm so generously bestowed on their contemporaries in England. Yet if this volume has only occasional fine poetic achievement, there is throughout it, at least, a keen sense of the poetical and a high standard of poetic expression—the elements which may combine in true poetry when inspiration strikes them.

What is lacking is not poetic imagination, but real inspiration, the spark which is struck from the clash of conflicting enthusiasms or bursts from a common enthusiasm, with a common faith and hope and love. The poets perceive the vague, impotent bigness and nerveless complexity of modern life; but what is it all about? Whither are we tending? What is there in our vast material civilization and feeble philanthropy to kindle their souls? And so, instead of being on fire, they are visibly striving after some master sentiment or idea to kindle their imagination into poetic expression. Hence the strained note of so many among them. Hence too the many varied tendencies in this volume, which mirrors, in little, our anarchic age.

These remarks may be verified, we believe, in examining the poems in this volume by Ridgely Torrence, George Sterling, Angela Morgan, Orrick Johns, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Herman Scheffauer, all of them highly gifted in poetry and all needing the spark from heaven to kindle their poetic gifts. Their power is ineffective, their vision vague and clouded. Probably, however, we should except the author of the most original poem in the volume, "Renascence." Edna St. Vincent Millay, was a girl of only nineteen when she wrote this remarkable piece, remarkable not because it was written by a young girl but because it expresses great conceptions in the simplest form. There are imperfections which mar its beauty quite seriously, but she is certainly a very promising poet.

Some of the older-fashioned poems are more successful. The best of all is the beautiful ode "To a Thrush" by T. A. Daly, a poet with a heart who believes it is a poet's business "to let himself go." There is high poetry in this piece because it expresses the genuine and keen feeling of a gifted poet. Those only were surprised at the perfection of its form who had never read his "Song for May." Another contribution to this volume very perfect in its way is Joyce Kilmer's "Martin," simple, unpretentious and homely, but as charming and human as Martin himself.

Our readers may like to know that the first prize was awarded to Orrick Johns, and the second prizes to T. A. Daly, and George Sterling. The editor speaks of "The Lyric Year" as aspiring "to the position of an Annual Exhibition or Salon of American poetry." If this aspiration be realized, it ought to stimulate some of our poets to do their best.

JOHN F. FENLON.

La Vénérable Emilie de Rodat, fondatrice des Religieuses de la Sainte-Famille de Villefranche-de-Ronergue (1787-1852).
 Par Mgr. J. F. Ernest Ricard, archevêque d'Auch. 1 vol.
 12mo de la Collection "Les Saints." Paris, Lecoffre (J. Galbada et Cie). 1912. Pp. xv + 210.

The admirable collection of biographies in this series (Les Saints) makes it clear that the heroes and heroines of faith, who have conquered the world in its warfare against the spirit, are not confined to any one period in the history of the Church. The life of the venerable servant of God which Archbishop Ricard relates with such touching devotion contains a profound lesson for Catholics of the present. Emilie de Rodat devoted herself to the cause of religion in the sphere where the need seemed to be greatest. Faith was assailed in the most insidious and most dangerous manner, namely through false methods of education. To meet this danger she collected around her a band of devoted women to undertake the task of educating young girls. Her biography is a narrative of difficulties and obstacles which were bravely overcome. A knowledge of her purposes and her devotion to the service of others will unquestionably do much to remove the spirit of oppression which gave rise to the "Associations Law."

PATRICK J. HEALY.

Das Missale als Betrachtungsbuch: Vorträge über die Messformularien. Von Dr. Franz Xaver Reck. Fünfter (Schluss-) Band. Herler, Freiburg and St. Louis, 1912. 8°. Pp. viii + 451.

With this volume Dr. Reck ends his task of showing how the Missal may be used as a book for devotion and meditation. The plan of the work is well known. The various parts of the proper of the Mass, Introit, Prayers, Graduale, Epistle, Gospel, Post-Communion, etc., are explained and elucidated at length, with a view to bring out the great spiritual truths they contain. This volume deals with that portion of the Missal devoted to Lent and especially Holy Week. While the main purpose of the author has been to write a book of devotion, he has accomplished another

equally edifying and not less instructive in showing how the various parts of the masses have been brought together and thus illustrating the meaning and significance of liturgical times and seasons. One feature of the work especially commendable is the wealth of material it contains for instructive discourses based on Scriptural texts specially applicable to the various liturgical cycles.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

Der Hl. Bernhardin von Siena und die Franziskanische Wanderpredigt in Italien während des XV. Jahrhunderts.
Von Dr. Karl Hefele. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis, 1912.
8°. Pp. xi + 300.

The dearth of literature on the subject of popular preaching in the middle ages, especially the fifteenth century, makes the publication of this careful and scholarly work especially welcome. The author calls attention to the two great periods in the activity of the Franciscans as itinerant preachers, the thirteenth century, the time of St. Francis, and the fifteenth century which might be called the time of St. Bernardine of Siena. Several introductory chapters are devoted to the history of popular preaching as practised by the Franciscans in the fifteenth century. In graphic phrases the wandering friars are shown laboring zealously among the masses of the people and going from town to town and from country to country arousing the faith and rebuking the vices of the people. It is doubtful whether there were ever more successful religious "revivals" than those witnessed in the period under discussion. In some places business was suspended at certain times in the day to allow the populace to attend the sermons of the Frati. These sermons were most frequently delivered in the open air and were of just the quality to suit the capacity of the congregation. Various subjects of interest in connection with this extra-parochial preaching come in for due attention. There are chapters on the relations between the Friars and the diocesan clergy and their relations to the other Orders, the results of their preaching, etc. The life of St. Bernardine is described without detail or elaboration and with the intention of showing the place he holds as a great popular preacher. The last part of the work is devoted

to an analysis of the oratorical and homiletic characteristics of the preaching of St. Bernardine, of his special mission and purposes as a preacher and especially of his style.

In addition to its value as a contribution to the history of preaching this work throws a valuable light on the life of the fifteenth century. The preachers were practical above all else and concerned themselves with actually existing conditions. What was reprehensible in the lives of the people they adverted to, and the telling rebukes administered to some congregations for their lack of devotion, inattention at Mass, etc., are a vivid portrayal of popular life to be found nowhere else. The great academic preachers of the middle ages have had many biographers but it is doubtful whether their studied phrases and academic discourses were such important factors in mediæval life as the eminently practical sermons of the wandering friars.

Dr. Hefele has produced a most charming book and laid students of mediæval life under a profound obligation.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

Life of George P. A. Healy. By his daughter Mary (Madam Charles Bigot). Edited by his Son and Daughters. Pp. 105.

Though this little volume is a tribute of devotion it is nevertheless merely a narrative of the life of an artist. Intimate details of family life and expressions of praise and veneration occur nowhere. In fact allusions of a personal character seem to be excluded only in as far as they are necessary to make clear some phase of the artist's activity. It is a biography of a man devoted to his profession rather than an account of a member of a family circle. Notwithstanding the care with which the peculiarly personal has been avoided, enough is said to reveal a man possessed of extraordinary mental and moral qualities and with unique singleness of purpose. The name of this great American is numbered among the world's great artists. His name is familiar on two Continents and it is singularly gratifying to know that his life so varied in its experiences and of such unremitting activity was that of a deeply and profoundly religious man. "He was mystically, sincerely, but most discreetly, religious. Born of a Catholic father

and a Protestant mother, he had been brought up in no particular form of worship. His art seemed to him religion enough. Then, through the influence of his friend, Bishop Fitzpatrick, of Boston, he became a most ardent Catholic. Once convinced he conformed his life to his creed, never speaking on the subject, never obtruding his belief on others. Only, almost invariably, he began his day of hard work by assisting at Mass."

PATRICK J. HEALY.

The Unbeliever, a Romance of Lourdes. By a non-Catholic. New York, Benziger Brothers, 1913. Pp. 243.

Many readers are acquainted with Zola's novel, *Lourdes*, in which the author, giving a vivid picture of pilgrim scenes at this famous shrine, distorts the significance of cures which he could not absolutely deny. In the present volume, the anonymous author, though not a Catholic, constructs a romance, in which the wonderful cures at Lourdes are taken to be undoubted workings of God's special agency, and became the means of turning a soul from irreligion to a life of fervent piety.

Felix Clement, a young Paris physician, is in love with his cousin, Andrée. She is a devout Catholic, while he is a confirmed agnostic. This wide diversity of religious views has all but shattered his hope of obtaining her consent to marriage. Andrée has a sister, Angélique, who is in the last stage of consumption. Having been pronounced incurable by her physicians, she was determined to make the pilgrimage to Lourdes to see if by supernatural means she could not regain her health. Dr. Felix strongly disapproves of what seems to him to be an act of sheer folly, but at the request of Angélique, he accompanies the invalid and her family on the pilgrimage. She is brought to Lourdes in a dying condition, and on the first day of the religious exercises, shows no sign of improvement. Andrée is deeply affected, and in her great desire to have the cure take place, secretly vows to become a nun and offers her own life as a substitute for that of her dying sister. The next day, Angélique is let down into the cold bath at the grotto and is suddenly cured. When the completeness of the cure is verified in the official bureau, Felix is impressed, but still does not believe. But a little later, when he finds himself before the

Blessed Sacrament, which is being borne in procession, he asks for a change of heart and to his great surprise is cured of an eye-defect. He recognizes the hand of God and believes. Thinking that every obstacle to marriage is now removed, he hastens to Andrée and is shocked to find her in the last stage of tuberculosis, and under a vow to die a nun. In a rage of despair, he goes to the shrine at daybreak, and is about to shoot himself, when a miraculous voice calls him to his sense of duty. He becomes a Franciscan and in after years leads the prayers for a band of pilgrims at Lourdes.

The story is cleverly told and enables the writer to depict vividly the typical scenes presented in a pilgrimage to Lourdes—the hospital train, the volunteer nurses and *brancardiers*, the bathing of the invalids, the blessings, the prayers, the processions, the medical examinations. The story is faulty, however, in the conclusion, where the supernatural element is employed far beyond the limits of probability.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

In St. Dominic's Country. By C. M. Anthony. New York, Longmans, 1913. Pp. 316. Price, \$1.60, net.

Miss Catherine Woodcock, writing under the pen name of C. M. Anthony, brings this delightful little book to the public, timidly and with the frank avowal that it is by no means a *critical* work. The reader will see for himself that the book while not a dry-as-dust musty tome, is not by any means merely a tissue woven of unsupportable statements or an idle coinage of the author's brain. It is a charming and delightful description of the places in which St. Dominic lived and wrought the extraordinary apostolic career and the high sanctity over which the Catholic world has marvelled these seven hundred years—but it all rests upon well proven, authentic facts and in so far it resembles some rugged piece of masonry covered with a riot of verdure and blossoms. Be this as it may, the work was begotten of an intense and fervid spirit of love and admiration of St. Dominic and his work and carries its message to the souls which are swayed by a similar spirit of admiration and love.

In an introductory note the author says: "The book is not a life

of St. Dominic—not even a connected history of the Saint between 1205-1219, the period which he passed almost entirely in France. Still less, though several chapters deal with this much discussed war, does it claim to be a history of the Albigensian Crusade. That history has yet to be written. It is simply an attempt to describe St. Dominic's country as it is to-day, for the benefit of those of his children who have not, and may never have, the opportunity of visiting it; and to stir in the hearts of others for whom such a pilgrimage is possible, a great desire to make it! With such descriptions history naturally links itself, and each town, each village is fragrant with memories of St. Dominic, many—though by no means all—of which are noted in their place.”

In a paragraph of the Introductory Note the author makes just acknowledgment of the sources from which she drew her information and from which she obtained the excellent and authentic illustrations which embellish the volume.

“I am also sincerely grateful to a large number of savants who have contributed not only valuable information but invaluable criticism. In a list of names far too long for quotation, which includes many French Dominican fathers, and the clergy of nearly all the parishes I visited—whom I would specially thank for their unfailing courtesy and kindness—a few must specially be mentioned: The Very Rev. Pierre Mandonnet, O. P., a historian of European fame, who has generously undertaken most of the responsibility of the French translation of this book, to which he is writing a Preface; The Very Rev. Fr. H. A. Montagne, O. P., Editor of the *Révue Thomiste*, and the Rev. F. M. Cazes, O. P., its secretary. Many Dominicans of this university, both Professors and students, have contributed expert information on various subjects. It was to gain such information that the book was written at Fribourg. I would also thank specially the Very Rev. Jean Lestrade, Curé of Gragnague, Hte. Garonne, an eminent archæologist, and Mlle. Louise Giraud, of Montpellier, a well-known historical critic.

As regards the pictures I must also say a word. Some places are not illustrated at all, while of others several different views are given. The former are those in which, so far as we know, nothing is left on which St. Dominic's eyes could have rested; the latter are still full of traces of his presence, *e. g.*, Fanjeaux and Montréal. To the Rev. Fr. Rosaire Eckert, O. P., of Toulouse,

whose seventeen beautiful photographs have been specially taken for us, this book owes much of its value. The thanks of all Dominicans are due to him."

Our author tells us that while Saint Dominic was conducting the crusade against the Albigenses and the Catharists the truths of the Catholic Faith were set forth before all the people by one of the missionaries and the Catharist and Albigensian errors and falsehoods refuted. The heretics in their turn replied and the conferences daily closed with a series of questions and answers not unlike that introduced into Catholic missions in recent years. We see here how ancient and time-honored are practices one sometimes rashly condemns as modern innovations and unwarrantable practices.

There are two appendices—Appendix A contains a clear and specific statement of the *Catharist Heresy* as St. Dominic found it in France.

Appendix B contains a transcription of a Fourteenth Century ms. in which is charmingly told the legend of the manner in which *St. Dominic* learned to speak German—a transcription of the original ms. was made by the Very Rev. Dr. Franz Steffens, Professor of Palaeography in the University of Fribourg, Switzerland.

In the excellent Preface which he has written to the volume, Fr. Schwertner, O. P., borrows the exclamation made one day by the Atheist M. Thiers when addressing the left wing of the French Parliament, who were not a little disturbed by the manifestations of Lourdes. "Pilgrimages are not the vogue with us." Let us hope that the volume will give to the French atheist the lie in the throat deep as the lungs and bring into vogue the custom again of going on pilgrimages to the places which still remain hallowed after the long lapse of seven hundred years, by the sweet and gracious presence of St. Dominic.

ALBERT REINHART, O. P.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Commencement Exercises, 1913

The Catholic University of America held its 24th Annual Commencement on Wednesday, June the 11th. The spacious Assembly Room of McMahon Hall was crowded to the utmost, and among the audience were noted many of the most distinguished persons in Washington. One hundred and sixteen degrees were granted, divided as follows: thirty-four A. B., thirty-three A. M., six B. S., ten LL. B., ten J. C. B., three J. C. L., nine S. T. D., three Ph. B., and three Ph. D. The degree of Doctor of Philosophy was conferred on the following: Rev. Paul Joseph Foik, Dissertation: "Pioneer Efforts of Catholic Journalism in the United States"; Rev. Matthew Francis McEvoy, Dissertation: "Fraternal Insurance with special Reference to Some Catholic Societies"; and Rev. Theodore Christian Petersen, C. S. P., Dissertation: "Unknown Copto-Arabic Grammar."

A notable feature of the Commencement was the granting of degrees to a large number of our Teaching Sisters. Twenty-three received the degree of Bachelor of Arts, and twenty-five the degree of Master of Arts. In all cases this implied a year of residence in the Teachers' College near the University. The dissertations of the Sisters who took the Masters of Arts degree were marked by unusual excellence.

The address to the graduates was delivered by Representative Graham, of Springfield, Ill. In his beautiful and masterful address he paid a special tribute to the presence of fifty teaching Sisters at the Commencement, and hailed the work of the Teachers' College for our Catholic Sisters as the most important step we have taken towards the unification of our Catholic school Sisters.

The Deans of the several schools of the University presented the following students for degrees:

In the School of Theology:—

For the degree of Bachelor of Sacred Theology (S. T. B.):

Rev. Vincent de Paul Archambault, Albany, N. Y.; Rev. Joseph

Eugene Brady, New York City; Rev. George Aloysius Gleason, Providence, R. I.; Rev. Thomas Bernard Gloster, Hartford, Conn.; Rev. Patrick David O'Connor, St. Louis, Mo.; Rev. William Grover Schmitt, Cincinnati, O.; Rev. Walter John Orchard, Paulist Congregation, Helena, Mont.; Rev. Michael Martin English, St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minn., Dubuque, Iowa.; Rev. Mathias Martin Hoffman, St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.

For the degree of Licentiate in Sacred Theology (S. T. L.):

Rev. Francis Aloysius Fadden, New York City; Dissertation: "The Neo-Scholastic Conception of Actual Grace."

Rev. George Joseph Hafford, New York City; Dissertation: "The Teaching of Our Lord by Parables."

Rev. William Anthony Hemmick, Baltimore, Md.; Dissertation: "The Human Knowledge of Christ."

Rev. John William Marren, Providence, R. I.; Dissertation: "The Social Value of the Supernatural."

Rev. Robert Thomas Riddle, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dissertation: "The Morality of Strikes and Lockouts."

For the degree of Bachelor of Common Law (J. C. B.):

Rev. Joseph Roderick Allard, Dallas, Tex.; Rev. Vincent de Paul Archambault, Albany, N. Y.; Rev. John Lee Barley, Baltimore, Md.; Rev. Joseph Eugene Brady, New York City; Rev. Matthew Freeman Clarke, Providence, R. I.; Rev. Peter Joseph Gibbons, Providence, R. I.; Rev. John Xavier Murphy, Providence, R. I.; Rev. Patrick David O'Connor, St. Louis, Mo.; Rev. Eugene Brown Regan, Buffalo, N. Y.; Hugh Edgar Ryan, Natchez, Miss.

For the degree of Licentiate in Canon Law (J. C. L.):

Rev. John Joseph Featherston, Scranton, Pa.; Dissertation: "The Impediment of Disparity of Cult."

Rev. Thomas Joseph McHugh, Scranton, Pa.; Dissertation: "The Pauline Privilege."

Rev. James Joseph Mulholland, Scranton, Pa.; Dissertation: "Sponsalia."

In the School of Philosophy:

For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph. D.):

Rev. Paul Joseph Foik, Holy Cross Congregation; Dissertation: "Pioneer Efforts of Catholic Journalism in the United States."

Rev. Matthew Francis McEvoy, Fond du Lac, Wis.; Dissertation: "Fraternal Insurance with Special Reference to Some Catholic Societies."

For the degree of Master of Arts (A. M.):

Rev. John O'Grady, Omaha, Neb.; Vernon Aloysius Coco, Marksville, La.; Charles Callan Tansill, Brookland, D. C.

For the degree of Bachelor of Arts (A. B.):

Thomas Raymond Robinson, Washington, D. C.; John Joseph Garvey, Providence, R. I.; James Leo McGuire, Riverpoint, R. I.; Ignatius Ambrose Hamel, Crookston, Minn.

For the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy (Ph. B.):

Albert Joseph Fleming, Scranton, Pa.; Francis James Fleming, Scranton, Pa.; Brother Matthew, St. Louis, Mo.

In the School of Law:

For the degree of Bachelor of Laws (LL. B.):

John Augustine Gallagher, Wylie, Tex.; Alfred James Hackman, Cleveland, Ohio; Vincent de Paul Dooley, Brooklyn, N. Y.; William Concannon Walsh, Cumberland, Md.; Henry Philip Kerner, St. Mary's, Pa.; John Terence Clancy, New York City; Christian James McWilliams, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Julius John Weber, Mahanoy City, Pa.; John Adam Helldorfer, Baltimore, Md.; Thomas Bernard Ryan, Fairfield, Vt.

In the School of Letters:

For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph. D.):

Rev. Theodore Christian Petersen, Paulist Congregation; Dissertation: "Unknown Copto-Arabic Grammar."

For the degree of Master of Arts (A. M.):

Rev. Patrick Aloysius Collis, Philadelphia, Pa.; Brother Jasper, F. S. C., Ammendale, Md.; Rev. Henry John Minea, St. Paul, Minn.; Rev. John Emerle Schwalbach, S. S., St. Austin's College; Henry Isidore Dockweiler, Los Angeles, Calif.

For the degree of Bachelor of Arts (A. B.):

James Francis Horan, So. Manchester, Conn.; Paul Cornelius Croarkin, Chicago, Ill.; Otto Sheibel Kretschmer, Saginaw, Mich.;

Charles Patrick McDonnell, Florence, Mass.; Clarence Nathan Touart, Mobile, Ala.; James Enright Woods, New London, Conn.; Stephen Edward Hurley, Fairmont, N. D.

In the School of Science:

For the degree of Bachelor of Science (B. S.):

Thomas John Mackin, Waukegan, Ill.

For the degree of Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering:

Eugene Michael Dwyer, Albany, N. Y.; Thesis: "Computations for the Design of a Highway Bridge."

Charles Patrick Maloney, Washington, D. C.; Thesis: "The History, Manufacture and Use of the Asphalt Block Pavement."

John Joseph Widmayer, Jr., Washington, D. C.; Thesis: "Water Supply of Washington, D. C."

Joseph Flading Robinson, Washington, D. C.; Thesis: "The Mineral Waters of Hot Springs, Arkansas."

For the degree of Bachelor of Science in Chemical Engineering.

Emery Joseph Theriault, Van Buren, Me.

Certificate of Proficiency in Architecture:

Edwin Leo Ball, Pineville, La.

In the Teachers College:

For the degree of Master of Arts (A. M.):

Sister M. Columkille, Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, San Antonio, Tex.; Sister Mary of the Immaculate Conception, San Antonio, Tex.; Sister Agnes Xavier, Sisters of Providence, St. Mary-of-the-Woods, Ind.; Sister Eugenia Clare, Sisters of Providence, St. Mary-of-the-Woods, Ind.; Sister M. Teresita, Sisters of Providence, St. Mary-of-the-Woods, Ind.; Sister Aloysia Marie, Sisters of Loretto, Nerinx, Ky.; Sister Mary Borgia, Sisters of Loretto, Nerinx, Ky.; Sister Miriam, Sisters of Loretto, Nerinx, Ky.; Sister M. Vitalis, Sisters of Loretto, Nerinx, Ky.; Sister M. Angelique, Sisters of Divine Providence, San Antonio, Tex.; Sister Mary of Good Counsel, Sisters of Divine Providence, San Antonio, Tex.; Sister St. Romuald, Grey Nuns of the Cross, Buffalo, N. Y.; Sister Mary of the Visitation, Grey Nuns of the Cross, Plattsburgh, N. Y.; Sister St. Edgar, Grey Nuns of the Cross,

Ogdensburg, N. Y.; Sister M. Antonia, Sisters of Charity of the B. V. M., Dubuque, Iowa; Sister M. Josephina, Sisters of Charity of the B. V. M., Dubuque, Iowa; Sister Thomas Aquinas, Third Order of St. Dominic, Sinsinawa, Wis.; Sister M. Ruth, Third Order of St. Dominic, Sinsinawa, Wis.; Sister M. Eva, Third Order of St. Dominic, Sinsinawa, Wis.; Sister M. Digna, Sisters of St. Benedict, St. Joseph, Minn.; Sister M. Jeanette, Sisters of St. Benedict, St. Joseph, Minn.; Sister M. Irma, Sisters of Mercy, Chicago, Ill.; Sister M. Catherine, Sisters of Mercy, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; Sister M. Ligouri, Sisters of St. Francis, Stella Niagara, N. Y.; Sister M. Germaine, Sisters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, Scranton, Pa.

For the degree of Bachelor of Arts (A. B.):

Sister M. Madeline, Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, San Antonio, Tex.; Sister James Aloysius, Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, San Antonio, Tex.; Sister M. Laurence, Sisters of St. Mary, Lockport, N. Y.; Sister M. Constance, Sisters of St. Mary, Lockport, N. Y.; Sister M. Beatrix, Sisters of St. Mary, Lockport, N. Y.; Sister St. Angela, Sisters of St. Mary, Lockport, N. Y.; Sister Vincent de Paul, Grey Nuns of the Cross, Buffalo, N. Y.; Sister M. Angela, Ursuline Sisters, Cleveland, O.; Sister M. Beatrice, Sisters of the Humility of Mary, Lowellville, O.; Sister M. Veronica, Benedictine Sisters, Brookland, D. C.; Sister M. Urban, Sisters of Charity of the B. V. M.; Dubuque, Iowa; Sister M. Justitia, Sisters of Charity of the B. V. M., Dubuque, Iowa; Sister M. Rosa, Sisters of Mercy, Hartford, Conn.; Sister M. Consolata, Sisters of Mercy, Hartford, Conn.; Sister Mary, Sisters of Divine Providence, San Antonio, Tex.; Sister M. Calixta, Sisters of Divine Providence, Newport, Ky.; Sister M. Pius, Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet, St. Louis, Mo.; Sister M. Rosina, Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet, Troy, N. Y.; Sister Mary of Nazareth, Sisters of Jesus-Mary, Woonsocket, R. I.; Sister M. Louis, Sisters of St. Joseph, Wichita, Kans.; Sister M. Gregory, Sisters of St. Joseph, Wichita, Kans.; Sister M. Geralda, Sisters of St. Francis, Stella Niagara, N. Y.; Sister St. Ignatius, Congregation de Notre Dame, Montreal, Can.

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

Gift to the Library. The Library of the University has just received a very valuable gift from the Treasurer of the University, Hon. Michael Jenkins of Baltimore, Md. It consists of two hundred volumes of Marylandiana, and is undoubtedly the most complete collection on the history, topography, etc., of Maryland. A future number of the *Bulletin* will contain a detailed description of the collection.

Lectures. During the first week of the holidays the Reverend Doctors Pace and Shields are engaged in giving a course of Lectures to the teaching Sisters at Montreal, Canada.—The Rev. Doctor Fox delivered the Baccalaureate Address at the Academy of the Sisters of Mercy, Hartford, Conn.—On Wednesday, June 18, the Rev. Doctor Turner gave the Baccalaureate Address at St. Mary's Academy, Monroe, Mich.—Dr. P. J. Lennox delivered the principal Address at the annual banquet of the Alumni of Duquesne University in Pittsburg, April 17. The text of the Address is published in the *Duquesne Monthly* for May, 1913.

